UC-NRLF
$B 281 121

Chester W. Wright

May, 1930.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/workingmanspolit00pickrich

THE WORKING MAN'S

POLITICAL ECONOMY,

FOUNDED UPON THE PRINCIPLE OF

IMMUTABLE JUSTICE,

AND

THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF MAN;

DESIGNED FOR THE PROMOTION OF

NATIONAL REFORM;

BY JOHN PICKERING

"When the working people gain their *just rights*, to controvert the doctrine of extortion will no longer be deemed illogical, dangerous, unscientific and absurd. That time must arrive; and, if I can do aught that will accelerate it, I shall esteem it the most happy, honorable and fortunate effort of my existence."—STEPHEN SIMPSON, *Cashier late U. S. Bank, Working Man's Manual, page* 41.

CINCINNATI:
STEREOTYPED IN WARREN'S NEW PATENT METHOD,
BY THOMAS VARNEY.
1847.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1847,
BY JOHN PICKERING,
In the Clerk's Office of the U. S. District Court, Ohio District.

dmh

HD8070
P5

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. Page.
The injustice of the present organization of Society, - - 3
CHAPTER II.
The means by which the many have been enslaved by the few, 15
CHAPTER III.
Inconsistency of American authors on Political Economy, 33
CHAPTER IV.
Legal and illegal robbery compared, - - - - 40
CHAPTER V.
Slavery to capital more degrading than chattel slavery, - 43
CHAPTER VI.
On the nature of property in general, - - - - 46
CHAPTER VII.
On the nature of capital, money, &c., - - - - 56
CHAPTER VIII.
Active and unproductive capital, considered, - - - 65
CHAPTER IX.
Debasing the circulating medium—its evil consequences, - 70
CHAPTER X.
Production and consumption of wealth, - - - 80
CHAPTER XI.
Wages of labor no equivalent for the labor performed, - 88
CHAPTER XII.
Fundamental errors of Governments, - - - - 95
CHAPTER XIII.
Human Rights clearly defined, - - - - - 101
CHAPTER XIV.
Permanent Funding System a violation of human rights, and therefore inimical to the happiness of society, - - 110
CHAPTER XV.
The Banking System--its injustice and demoralizing tendency; also its unconstitutionality, - - - - - 117
CHAPTER XVI.
A Protective Tariff inconsistent with a free government, - 144
CHAPTER XVII.
Rebellion—its nature, causes, and cure, - - - - 155

M508373

CHAPTER XVIII.

House rent--its oppressive action upon the producing classes, 162
The Temperance cause and National Reform, compared, - 164

CHAPTER XIX.

Warren's Equitable Commerce reviewed, and the incompetency of the Labor note as a medium of commercial exchange, demonstrated, - - - - - - - - 165

CHAPTER XX.

Conclusion, remedy for the moral, social and political evils, 178
Denton's Analytical Review of the Statistics of the United States, in which he shows that of all the wealth produced in the country, the sole producers of it, are only enabled to realize two-elevenths for their own use, the remaining nine-elevenths is absorbed by the non-producers, - - - - - - - - - - - 187
National Reform Songs, - - - - - 194 to 206

TO THE READER.

You will find, on perusing the Working Man's Political Economy, that the main object of the Author is to show by what means the productive classes of society may realize the just and equitable reward for their labor and toil. Its competency to effect so desirable an end, you will find, depends upon the truth or falsity of a single proposition, which is as follows:

If the legal money (or labor) value of the elements of nature were abolished, unconfounded and disconnected with the products of human labor, and all men left perfectly free to compete with each other in supplying their own and the wants of the public, (commercial demand,) the prices of all exchangeable things, including personal services and the precious metals, whether in the form of coin or not, would naturally, gradually, and without any artificial or arbitrary combination or organization whatever, gravitate to the cost of production, which is the natural, therefore the just and equitable limit of price. And such an equalizing result has only been prevented by the restrictive and coercive acts of government deriving the power to enforce them, by first monopolizing the soil, subjecting it and human flesh to money value, contrary to the law of immutable justice and the common rights of humanity.

The above proposition is true, or it is not. If it be true, it is very evident that, under the circumstances just mentioned, all persons engaged in useful pursuits would in the aggregate realize *an equal amount of the labor or service of others in exchange for their own;* therefore no one could become possessed of property but in proportion to his own industry or usefulness. And, surely, more than this, no honest man either could or would ask for: it being but even-handed justice—practical christianity—"reciprocal social intercourse"—equality of rights—"individual sovereignty"—"equitable commerce"—unity of interest—"doing unto others as we would that others should do unto us."

Under such a state of things, industry would become "attractive," and might be made "associative" and "organized" upon principles of justice and equity, but which never can be accomplished while human nature is what it is, if society continues to give a premium of four hundred and fifty per cent. for useless idleness over useful industry.

Place every man upon the same footing in regard to the elements, and *competition*, instead of being inimical to his happiness, will become his best friend. Competition only becomes antagonistical to

the happiness of man when the NONOPOLISTS OF THE SOIL and CAPITAL are combined with the strength of government on the one hand, and the landless and houseless producers isolated on the other, and thereby made to contend for the scanty crust that the LORDS OF THE LAND AND THE CAPITAL have determined they shall only enjoy.

Such are the settled convictions of the author of "The Working Man's Political Economy;" and if his views are not correct, it is the duty of others to show WHY.

Respectfully, JOHN PICKERING.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

Extracts from "Young America," November 27, 1847.

"THE WORKING-MAN'S POLITICAL ECONOMY," *by* JOHN PICKERING. *Cincinnati.* 1847.

"This work seems to be the first product of the National Reform movement in book form, and presents as well as extends its principles with the most pungent arguments. It is most admirably calculated to instruct the working man in the true nature of the wrongs by which he is oppressed, and in the rights to which he has never yet attained. It should circulate in the garb of every language throughout the world. Would to God it could be shot by the universal electric medium into the minds of every tenant and landlord, slave and master, hireling and employer, consumer and profitmonger, voter and legislator, upon earth. All parties would then see, that while luxurious monopoly, on the one hand, decimates millions of producers by destitution, it destroys, on the other, the race of nonproducers by superabundance. They would see that superfluity destroys the monopolizers themselves, as well as the destitute, by the tribute which they extort, and that it is the interest of all mankind to mutually protect each other in their rights. Never has a writer made so effective a use of the evidence of parties against themselves." LEWIS MASQUERIER.

"The new work of Mr. Pickering on Political Economy is worth more than all the books on the same subject before written, and shall receive further notice hereafter." ED. YOUNG AMERICA.

ERRATA.—Page 43, 9th line from top, for 30,000 read 300,000; page 118, 25th line from top, for "dirth" read *death.*

Page 33, top line, read American Authors.

PREFACE.

To "National Reformers," and the producing, or working classes, in general, this work is respectfully dedicated.

All systems of Political Economy, heretofore written and published to the world, have had, for their main object,—

First. The support and prosperity of a *Monarchy*, with its necessary appendages of titles of nobility, with various ranks of birth, grades of power and dignity, special privileges, &c.

Second. The support and prosperity of a *moneyed Aristocracy;* or, in other words, to sustain, justify and vindicate the interests and claims of capital; or a mixture of both. But, in both of these systems, the just claims of industry, or labor, has been entirely overlooked or forgotten. Furthermore, man's natural and inalienable rights have not been kept in view, or in any degree respected by the advocates of either.

The object of this work is, therefore, to expose and make manifest the false principles upon which they are founded; the evil tendency of their operation upon society in general; and what are the just claims of the producing or working classes. Also, to promote National Reform.

We have but one favor to ask of the reader, and that is, to read the work *carefully through*, previous to passing judgment upon it. And, if he discovers any errors in the principles laid down, false deductions, or discrepancies, it is his duty, as a good citizen, to expose them. But let him do so with a proper spirit, and in such a manner as becomes the dignity of a man: let his sole object be the development of truth, which is the sole object of the Author, not forgetting the good adage, that "the *right* is always *expedient*."

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

THE INJUSTICE OF THE PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY.

Whoever will but open his eyes, and take an unprejudiced view of society as it is now organised, cannot fail to observe that men do *not* accumulate property in proportion to their industry; but the reverse is the fact. In all so called civilized countries, we see that "men are respected in proportion as they are enabled by the possession of wealth to command the labor or service of others, *and so essentially necessary are indolence and uselessness to respectability, that men are despised in proportion as they apply their own hands to purposes of utility.*"—(J. Gray.)

Every where we see toiling millions the slaves of the capitalist; consequently we find unconsumable wealth in the possession of a few, while poverty, discomfort and wretchedness is the lot of the great mass of the people. These truths stare us in the face; they cannot be denied. The rich few overburthened with wealth; the poor suffering with want. The history of the world shows us this fact, that in all civilized countries, as the rich become richer, the poor become poorer; the greater the amount of wealth in a country, the less is the poor man's share, and the harder has he to work for a bare subsistence, and as the capitalist rises in riches, power and splendor, so in proportion the working man sinks into poverty, want and wretchedness. And when a country becomes completely glutted or overstocked with wealth, as is the case in England at this time, then has the working man reached the climax of his misery, degradation and wretchedness. He would be glad to labor, but is denied the privilege. The capitalist will not employ him, being unable to realize

profit on his labor; therefore is he turned into the street to *starve, to beg, or to steal;* he must do one or the other, there is no alternative; or *die.* (*These are the privileges of the Free Laborer.*) The negro slave-holder cannot do this; his interest will at least prompt him to keep his slaves in a healthy working condition, so that he may take the best advantage of their ability to labor when again the market opens, or in other words, when the surplus wealth is disposed of.

Besides all this, in all countries where negro slavery exists, the master is bound by law to provide for and maintain in sickness or old age those upon whose labor he has grown rich; but no such responsibility is imposed upon the capitalist, neither is there any such provision for the well being of the white laborer when he becomes old and infirm—unable to endure his former amount of toil; although his labor and toil has overburthened with wealth his master, the capitalist, himself becomes a vile cumberer of the ground, an incubus on society, and like the Son of man, "hath no place whereon to lay his head," hath none to sympathise with him, or care for him, but those who are in the same situation as himself, therefore unable to assist him; in fact he is a thing fit and worthy only to *suffer and die,* and the sooner he is out of the way, the better. True he may take refuge in a poor house, to do which is held to be degrading by all classes, and is revolting to all men of dignified feelings, and to propose it, is an insult to any honest, industrious man, who is possessed in the smallest degree of conscious integrity and self respect; the very idea is too loathsome to be endured by those who are conscious in justice deserve a better fate.

(For a proper understanding of the nature and operation of the poor house system, when carried out to perfection, the reader is referred to an admirable work called "The Condition and Fate of England, by C. E. Lester,' which is a book every American ought to read.)

If, therefore, what has just been stated be true, (and who can doubt it? surely no one,) then is the condition of the negro slave (who has a good master) preferable to that of the poor white man; the former having a master interested at least in his being in a healthy condition; and whether he work or play, be young or old, sick or well, the master is bound to feed, clothe and shelter him to the latest period

of his existence; while the latter cannot obtain one, (that is a master that cares for him,) though he offers to sell himself from day to day for the veriest pittance sufficient to keep body and soul together.

We do not make these remarks as an apology for chattel slavery.

We will, perhaps, be told that such a state of things cannot occur in this country, in consequence of having better institutions, cheap land, no kings, no titled nobility, no law of primogeniture, &c.

True, we have no political kings, but we have our land kings and our money kings, whose mandates are quite as imperative, quite as tyrannical—are as destitute of the feelings of humanity, and fleece the people just as well and just as certainly as any bona fide king of the old world. We have no titled nobility it is true; but we have institutions composed exclusively of capitalists, whose influence has often controlled even our legislators, from whom they have obtained special privileges which in their operation produce the same evils in society that titles of nobility do in other countries: the object of both being to concentrate the wealth of a country into the hands of the wealthy few, from the hands of the working classes as fast as it is produced by them; giving in exchange for solid wealth, such as houses, lands, provisions, &c., little bits of paper which cost nothing to make, decorated with pictures, and promises to pay when it suits the convenience of their lordships; besides many other cunningly devised pauper making contrivances, which we intend to examine in detail, and expose the injustice of their operation. We have only abolished the shadow, the power and substance we still retain with all its baneful consequences.

Titles of nobility would be of no value to the possessors, but for the power derived from them of securing titles to land, and the products of other mens' labor.

All this is accomplished just as well, and quite as certain, without the aid of titles as with them, as we shall endeavor to demonstrate in its proper place.

The evils brought on a community, by the means of special privileges, are not in the least abated or diminished; because they may be transferred from one to another. Let us suppose A, B, and C the community. If A has the privilege, it is at the expense of B and C; if B has it, it is

at the expense of A and C; if C has it, it is at the expense of A and B. Now, as it is impossible to play this game equally in a large community, there must always be a suffering party, which is always the poor, they never having a hand in the game. Besides, if it could be played equally, they would end just where they begun precisely: just like the three robbers, who, when business was dull and victims were scarce, agreed to rob one another for the purpose of keeping their hands in; and business moving; in other words, make prosperous times.

If a title of nobility, or special privilege, works evil in society, whatever that evil may be, it can never be altered, annuled, or obviated, by the mere circumstance that the power which works that evil may be transferred from one to another. This truth must be obvious to all. Therefore, the argument so often brought forward to sustain the position of those who advocate the justice and propriety of granting special privileges, under a government based upon the principle of equal rights to all, *falls to the ground.* The word is a solecism, a perfect absurdity, and is no consistent part of our American government.

The real evil conferred upon a community, by means of titles of nobility and special privileges, is that they concentrate the wealth of a country into the hands of a few. This makes the mass poor.

The reader must remember, that it is not with men, or with mere words, that we make battle, but with false principles. If our observations may sometimes appear harsh, refer them to the principles, not to the men who act under their influence; because they have been impressed upon our minds by the force of surrounding circumstances, over which we have had no control. And so long as men act under the influence of false impressions and do wrong, they can in no way be proper subjects of blame. Therefore, if we wish to find truth, we must search for it diligently; lay aside prejudice, open our eyes, our ears, and our understanding, never forgetting that all truths are consistent with each other. When we have discovered one truth to a certainty, discard all inconsistencies with it; and so on from truth to truth, fear nothing. "Prove all things, (by comparison,) hold fast that which is good;" and when we have found a truth, let us not be afraid to speak it; aye, and with a bold and manly front, maintain it against all opposition.

The working classes are more deeply affected by the *evils* which afflict society, than any others; they alone must remove them, no others either *can or will*. It may be done, too, without doing injustice to a single individual; it must and will be done; the good and virtuous have nothing to fear. The history of the world teaches us the folly of telling the wealthy and powerful, they ought not to oppress their fellow men; when they have been taught from infancy up to manhood, by precept, by example, and in the books, that this is their legitimate and proper vocation · not only so, but is incumbent on them as a duty, under the plea that the prosperity of the public is promoted by it, therefore a virtue.

This will be fully shown in its proper place.

It is by no means a pleasant task, to be thus exposing the evils brought on us either by the ignorance or dishonesty of those who have hitherto controlled our destiny. But it must be done: justice and humanity imperiously demand it, and no honest man (who understands the subject) can object to it.

Much as we respect and would like to promote the good feelings of our fellow men, still our respect for truth, justice and humanity is much greater; let this be our apology, remembering that we battle not with men, but false principles.

Our would-be lords and masters may tell us we ought to stick to the plough, to the hammer, the anvil, the last, and the jack plane. Though they may reprove us in the following language of the poet, still we must speak:

"Why shall ev'ry low bred wretch of letters,
Dare to speak the truth against his lordly betters!!
Let ragged virtue stand aloof,
Nor mutter accents of reproof;
Let ragged wit a mute become,
When *wealth* and power would have her dumb."

CHURCHILL.

Still we cannot be dumb.

There was a time, no doubt, when it would have been little short of madness, to have attempted to publish to the world such truths as are put forth in this book; but, thanks to God, by His providence in the course of human progression, that time is happily and swiftly passing away.

The mass of mankind are beginning to perceive that they have been imposed upon by their rulers, who have disregarded the poor man's just rights; they have clothed error in the garb of truth, and truth with that of error, so that the one has been taken for the other. Consequently error has been heaped upon error, vice upon vice, and crime upon crime, till the world is literally overwhelmed with confusion; and man is nowhere found virtuous and happy.

To prove that this is no idle chimera, or the phantom of a diseased brain, but a frightful reality, read the following from one of the most aristocratic publications, perhaps, in the world:

"British Pauperism.—According to a writer in Blackwood's Magazine, the number of paupers in Great Britain is 4,000,000, or one-seventh part of the entire population of the empire. The proportion is as follows: In England 1,500,000; in Ireland 2,300,000; in Scotland 200,000. Since 1815, a period of only thirty years, there has been raised for the relief of the poor in England alone, upwards of £200,000,000, or about one thousand million of dollars. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated, by the returns of the income tax, that there are seventy thousand persons in the empire whose annual revenue is $200,000,000, or about £2,300 each. This monstrous inequality of human condition, remarks the Concord Freeman, in a country the richest and most industrious the world has ever seen, is alarming to the last degree, and almost shakes ones faith in divine justice; for its greatest effect is seen in the prodigious increase of immorality and crime. During the last forty years, crime has increased at a tenfold greater rate than population. It is obvious that a state of things so radically wrong cannot long continue. A general overturn must come, and the world will experience even a greater shock than was felt at the outbreak in France, a little more than fifty years since. What is terrible in the picture, is the contrast which it presents to the contemplative spectator. The foreground is filled with all that can please the eye and captivate the mind; but behind that is a destiny of evil, an accumulation of hideous objects, which absolutely appal the stoutest hearts that beat in human breasts. The wealth of England is no dream, but a real, tangible matter; it is no exaggerated thing, like the accounts which we have in eastern story of accumulations of coin and precious stones in the treasury of this or that ruler—but it is solid, substantial, and an instrument of real power. On the other hand is the poverty of the masses, a poverty of so squallid a character, that even the mendicity of Southern Europe appears happiness by comparison with it. For, to appreciate the entire evils of the case, it must be clearly remembered, that while the la-

roni are practical philosophers, and almost literally produce nothing, the English poor are many of them the hardest workers on earth, and those who are idle would work, could they find employment. England owes her wealth to them. They have dug it from her mines, they have created it in her factories and work-shops, they have drawn it from the waters of every ocean, 'from Zembla to the Line,' and in its accumulation have periled every thing that is dear to life. Their reward for all this is starvation to themselves and their children, or the bitter bread of forced charity, grudgingly provided by the hearts as cold as polar ice, and dealt out by the hands that would fain strangle the recipients of the churlish morsel What a commentary is this on the popular dogma, that honest industry ever meets with its fitting reward! Of old it was said that he who would not work, neither should he eat; now, he who works, or who is willing to work, cannot get food, except as a pauper.

It is sad to think upon. And it adds to the gloom which the contemplation of so black a picture excites, when we observe that we are treading in the same road which has led the people of England into a vast quagmire—that we are following the identical *ignes fatui* which have led that great race to the miry gulf, whose insatiable wants are stayed not by swallowing empires—the terrible Serbonian bog, in which it would seem are to be engulphed 'the hopes of all men in every nation.'"

If God has implanted in man a desire to associate with his own species, which is evidently the case, *society is the natural condition of man.*

If, then, society, as now organised, produces the most overwhelming evils, and gives to man the power of exercising over his fellow man every description of oppression, tyranny, cruelty and injustice, it is certain, yes positively certain, either that *God has created man for wretchedness in this world*, or that man has yet to learn the principles on which society must be founded to make him happy."

GRAY.

This conclusion is irresistible and self evident. In view of these facts before us, shall we still slumber on in delusive security? shall we sing peace, while there is no justice? shall we be told that things are well enough, while millions are starving in the midst of abundance? Shall we perceive these evils coming swiftly upon us, without an effort to avert the calamity?

To hold our peace we cannot, dare not. God forbids it. Humanity forbids it. The very stones would cry out against us, were we to hold our peace.

Working men, wake up, wake up! To us belongs the

task of commencing the work of moral reform; we have trusted our self-made masters too long. We must work out our own salvation ourselves; but not with fear or trembling; none but those who oppress their fellow men need do this. Let us not be rash or hasty; first be sure we are right, then press forward.

Being conscious of our integrity, the purity of our motives, and the justness of our cause, let *onward*, be our course; looking neither to the right nor left, never cease our exertions till man is restored to his natural and inalienable rights.

If we are successful, millions yet unborn will rejoice in the fruits of our victory. We shall no doubt be stigmatized as disorganizers, levellers, rebels, thieves, robbers, and other choice epithets from the vocabulary of law and order. Our principles will be misconstrued, misrepresented, and our motives arraigned. For this we must be prepared, as this has been the common lot of all who have attempted to improve the condition of mankind, from the earliest ages down to the present moment: *of this we ought to be proud.* Is it not virtuous to *destroy* evil? Surely it is. Did not Christ come to destroy the works of the Devil, and to disorganize the Jewish Church; to level and break down the corruptions of its priesthood? Certainly he did. And for so doing, was he not crucified by the then advocates of law and order. Galileo was incarcerated in a dungeon for promulgating the truth, by the advocates of law and order. Socrates suffered death for preaching new doctrines, and that too at the hands of the friends of law and order.

How often have we been told, that to resist tyranny is obedience to God, and our hearts have always joyfully responded to the truth of the sentiment. It can make not the least difference as to who the tyrant is, whether he be a kingly despot, a capitalist, or a landlord, so he does but oppress his fellow men and violate their just rights.

Martin Luther, John Huss, George Fox, William Penn, and a host of others that might be named, were all disorganizers. That now famous band of dauntless heroes, who signed that memorable instrument called the Declaration of Independence, were disorganizers because they abolished all the laws of the land at a blow. They were levellers also, because they declared that all men's rights *were equal;* that is, the same, or alike for *all* men.

These honest, unflinching, unterrified patriots, have set us a noble example; let us profit by it. Although we hold these men in such high esteem among us, yet the men of law and order of that day, branded them as rebels and traitors; and adjudged all and each of them worthy only of a halter, and would have suffered accordingly, if the men of law and order could have succeeded in getting them into their power; this Providence otherwise ordered

Shall we be told in the middle of the nineteenth century, that it is wicked to insist on having our rights? Away with such absurdities. We, the people of this mighty republic, are its sovereigns; our rulers for the time being, our servants, and they are bound to do our bidding. So, then, if our opponents revile us, let us not revile again, nor in any way excite their combativeness; but ever present a bold, undaunted and fearless attitude; endeavor to convince our adversaries of the truth and justice of our cause, that our object is to injure no one, but to procure justice for all, to carry out practically the great principle of the christian religion—that of doing to all men what we should wish all men to do unto us. Therefore, we ask nothing of our fellow men, nor of government either, that we are not willing to grant freely to all. If this be wrong, let our opponents show us the why and wherefore. We shall now dismiss this part of the subject, by a quotation from Paley's Moral Philosophy, who is an orthodox author; in which he gives us a beautiful and correct illustration of the present unjust and unnatural state of society:

"If you should see (says Mr. Paley) a flock of pigeons in a field of corn; and if (instead of each picking where and what it liked best, taking just as much as it wanted and no more,) you should see ninety-nine of them gathering all they got into a heap; reserving for themselves nothing but the chaff and the refuse; keeping this heap for one, and that the worst perhaps of the whole flock; sitting round and looking on all the winter, whilst this one was devouring, wasting, and scattering it about; and if a pigeon more hardy or hungry than the rest, touched a grain of the hoard, all the others flying instantly upon it and tearing it to pieces; if you should see this, you would see nothing more than what is daily practised and established among men."

"Among men you see the ninety and nine toiling and scraping together a heap of superfluities for one; (and this one, too, oftentimes, the very worst of the whole set, a woman, a child, a mad-

man, or a fool;) getting nothing for themselves all the while, but a little of the coarsest of the provision which their own industry produces; looking quietly on, while they see the fruits of their labor and toil spent, spoiled, or wasted by the idle; and if one of the number dare but touch a particle of the hoard, the others joining against him, and imprisoning or hanging him for" (what law and order men call) "the theft."

This is called justice! Mr. Paley himself thinks that the foregoing view of civilization is very paradoxical and unnatural, but still such institutions are of immense benefit to mankind, inasmuch as they tend to increase the produce of the earth, and prevent contests among men. The last conclusion seems to us quite ridiculous; as experience teaches us, that the more law, the more contention.

There has lately come to light a small scrap of history, relating to King George III. and Dr. Paley, which is of much importance to mention in this place. It is found in a late number of Littell's Living Age, and is as follows:

"At a meeting of the King's Council, at which a bishop was to have been appointed, a member proposed Dr. Paley; at the mention of whose name, his majesty cried out, what! what! what! Pigeon Paley!—make Pigeon Paley a bishop? No, no, no; never."

The king very consistently considered it would never do to reward a man for telling the truth. Notwithstanding but a very few words were written by the Doctor, and that few he had white-washed over in a very ingenious manner, still the king could never forgive him. It is precisely so in the present day; those who rule the destinies of mankind, would never forgive an individual who should attempt to expose the injustice of that "paradoxical and unnatural" code of law by which the world is now governed.

Fellow working men, having taken notice of some of the most prominent and glaring evils consequent upon society, especially to the working classes, by the present unnatural organization of our institutions; we now solemnly call upon you, as you value your own happiness, your security from future want and misery, and the future well being of your children, to take this subject into your most serious consideration; open your eyes, your ears, and your understanding; examine every argument that may be brought forward in this work carefully and critically; then judge for yourselves as to the truth or falsehood of

what we have laid before you. Commit the principle arguments to memory, especially those which involve first principles; when you understand them aright, you cannot fail to perceive the truth. Never conclude that any thing is necessarily true, merely because found stated in this book, or any other book; nor merely because some great personage says so—this would be taking truth upon trust; but judge for yourselves, bearing in mind that all truths are consistent with one another; and also, that all truths which are necessary for the promotion of our happiness, are capable of being demonstrated; and when we are fully armed with the truth, one can chase a thousand of such as are in error, and two can put ten thousand to flight.

The following sentiments are extracted from the "Working Man's Manual," by Stephen Simpson, formerly Cashier of the United States Bank, published 1831:

"If ever a party set out upon scientific principles, grounded on mathematical precision, it is surely that of the working men. They are a philosophical, political, economical party. They have gone to the fountain head of first principles, and dragged forth justice from the turbid waters of time. They have analyzed the elements of national wealth and individual happiness. They have detected the errors of established systems, and exposed the injustice of privileged orders, vested with exclusive rights *to accumulate wealth at the sacrifice of those who produce it!* Constituting in fact a large majority of society, they have at length discovered, that they have heretofore been voting for representatives who make laws on principles directly inimical to their industry, prosperity and interest—instead of supporting, for those high trusts, men who will be true to the grand fundamental doctrines of constitutional equity. 'Forming the bulwark' (and being the very bone and sinew) 'of the nation in time of war, as well as the' (*only*) 'source of its opulence at all times, they have found themselves oppressed in a period of profound peace, by a militia system, as onerous, as degrading, and as futile as it is immoral—a system which never reaches to the idle drove of society' (who are continually preying upon its vitals.) 'Finding their want of education an impediment to the correction of the abuses practised on them, they have claimed *Public Instruction* for their children, and have been answered by the sneer of derision on the one hand, and the cry of revolution on the other. It is even pronounced dangerous to let them know, *what no art can conceal from them*, and no sophistry induce them to disbelieve, that they produce all the wealth of society without sharing a thousandth part of it! that they do all the work, elect all the public functiona-

ries, fight all our battles, gain all our victories, cause all our enjoyments to flow upon us, generation after generation and age after age, and still remain destitute of the frugal store of competence, which ought always in justice to be the reward of industry.'"

If there is danger in the announcement of this monstrous system of injustice, let wrong be removed, and the danger will cease; *but the danger ought to exist, whilst such an oppressive result flows with mathematical precision from the present perverted organization of government.*

"Most of our capital is of the fictitious kind. If we had none but what is really capital—gold and silver, or real property—"(products of labor)—"perhaps capital would no longer prove the enemy of labor, nor the cormorant of industry. Such, however, is not the fact. What is monopoly? Capital combined, to acquire the products of labor without giving value, and to dispose of them for more than value. In this brief definition, we have a full display of the extortionate character of capital, as it generally appears in the present age.

"The only true and just mode of distributing" (the products of) "labor, is by giving value for value." (Or, in other words, exchanging equal quantities of labor.)

So says Stephen Simpson, the banker. In order that the producers of wealth may be able to throw off the shackles that bind them in absolute slavery to the arrogant claims of the unfeeling capitalist, Mr. Simpson says: "As capital is vested in the *few*, and labor resides in the *many*, it only requires that the latter combine to bring government into their own hands, to secure all they desire." To promote the attainment of this end, is the object of publishing this work. Mr. Simpson says: "At first the struggle will be great and arduous; but perseverence and concord, on expansive grounds, must finally lead to a signal triumph." So say we.

CHAPTER II.

THE MEANS BY WHICH THE MANY HAVE BEEN ENSLAVED BY THE FEW.

It must be evident to all who have reflected on the subject, and indeed history confirms the conclusion, that, in the first stages of an approach towards civilization, much strife and contention must have existed with regard to man's rights to the ownership of property. Such being the case, the natural instinct of self-preservation has been a sufficient impulse to convince a community of the necessity of making laws of some kind or other. In all countries, and in all ages, the law-making power has resided only in the hands of the few. Whether this power has been usurped or delegated, is of little consequence in this place: at all events, they have been conspicuous men in community; men of talents, (that is, men who understand the use and power of words,) men of wealth, and, above all things, great lovers of law and order. Whether these men were men of honest integrity, remains yet to be seen; but that they should make some great efforts to provide well for themselves, is not in the least to be wondered at; though we think they had but a short-sighted view of their own permanent interest.

Axiom 1. We lay down as an axiom, that we secure our own happiness best by promoting that of all men; or, in other words, the happiness of mankind is promoted and secured best where men's rights are least violated.

Ax. 2. That government is only *just*, which secures to all men their *just rights*.

The absolute, natural, unalienable rights of all men are:

1. "The right to personal security in an uninterrupted enjoyment of life, his limbs, his health and his reputation." —*Blackstone.*

We add,

2. The right to own and possess as property whatever may be made or produced by the energies and capabilities of the body and limbs, of which he only is the rightful owner; and this property he has a right to keep, to destroy, to consume, to give or bequeath, and to sell or ex-

change; and when he parts with any portion of it for the use of others, he has a right to an equivalent.

3. The right to the equal use of all the elements as they exist in a state of nature, to wit: air, sunshine, land, water, fruits, vegetables, wild animals, fish, &c.

Now these, we contend, are the natural and unalienable rights of all men; the truth of which are self-evident; for the proof of which, let every one who may feel disposed to object to any of them, say which of them he himself is willing to relinquish, or that would be wrong for him to claim. We say, let him ask himself the question; and if he be an honest seeker after truth, he will find there is but one way to answer. *Not one*, every man would say, without an exception.

Furthermore, we contend that all the evils depicted in the first chapter have been entailed upon us by the learned, cunning, knowing, crafty few, by totally disregarding our rights; by giving us error for truth, wrongs for rights, and the mere jingle of words for knowledge. Their first great and masterly stroke of policy being to hoodwink and blindfold Justice, to prevent her from taking cognizance of the enormities they were about to commit in her name.

For the truth of these statements, we will open their own books, and let them condemn themselves.

Mr. Paley tells us, (page 59, vol. 3,) that the real foundation of our rights is the laws of the land. This being the case, it follows, as a matter of course, that, as the rights to property depend upon the law of the land, a man has a right to take away any amount of property whatever from others, without being obliged to give an equivalent, so he can but screen himself behind the law: he may commit any enormity whatever, so he can have influence to get law to protect him; without any regard to man's natural rights whatever, or what is justly due from man to man. Is it any wonder, then, that the world is filled with crime and misery? Not any. This, being a fundamental principle in law, is still adhered to in the present day, and will so remain until the mass discover in what way they have been enslaved; then will they rise up in the majesty of their strength, and decide that this state of injustice shall exist no longer.

Let every one ask himself the question: Can this declaration of Mr. Paley have any tendency in securing men in

the enjoyment of their natural and unalienable rights? There is but one answer can be given. This is one of the falsities, by the use of which the many have become enslaved by the few. Mr. Paley admits, (page 60,) that a bad use is apt frequently to be made by the establishment of this principle, as in many cases it will authorize the most flagitious chicanery. This is just what all honest men think. Mr. Paley further says, at the end of the same chapter: "Property is the principle subject of justice"; but as to persons being the subjects of justice, he says nothing. This was very prudent, his book being made for the rich to read; not the poor. Mr. Blackstone tells us, (vol. 1, page 124,) "That the first and primary object and end of human laws, is to maintain and regulate the absolute rights of individuals, which are, in themselves, few and simple, and are as follow: the right of personal security in an uninterrupted enjoyment of life, his limbs, his body, his health, and his reputation." (As to man's rights to his just proportion of land, and to the products of his own labor, he says nothing in particular, though it may, with much propriety, be included in, and rightly inferred from the declaration he gives us.) In the face of this declaration, Mr. Blackstone sets to work and writes four large volumes, each containing about 500 quarto pages; the object and end of which is to show, in a systematical manner, how a few, by laws and rules, made exclusively by themselves, with nothing to check or restrain them but their own self-love and natural love of ease, dominion and self-aggrandizement, and by what means and by what rules man's absolute, natural and unalienable rights might and should be violated, (except in their own cases,) set at naught, totally disregarded, and trampled under foot by kings, nobles, lords, dukes, barons, counts, earls, generals, and many other dignitaries, magistrates, landlords, capitalists, bankers, &c., &c.: also, by what rules they might take away that life which all men had an absolute right to enjoy; what kind of ceremony they should make use of previous to chopping off a brother's head, his hands, or his ears, stringing him on a gallows, branding his flesh with a red hot iron; how they might condemn him to the gallies for life, banish him from the land of his birth, incarcerate him in a dungeon, rob him of his unalienable right in the soil, and plunder him of the products of the labor of his own hands;

in short, commit every species of crime with perfect impunity, without the slightest fear of punishment: (having the implements of torture in their own hands, with the power and will to use them,) but, on the contrary, are rewarded with crowns of glittering gold, set with diamonds and other precious stones, coronets, orders of kighthood of the star and garter, mitres, robes of honor, commissions to kill, and many other dignities and pompous marks of distinction.

They are clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day; they live in splendid halls and marble palaces, ride with much pomp in expensive coaches drawn with many horses, and occupy the highest seats in the synagogue; they require the service of many of their fellow men, to wait upon them, to wash them, dress and undress them, and put them to bed, as though they were helpless infants. They require us to salute them with pompous titles, as, "your most gracious Majesty," "your Grace," "my Lord," and "the Right Honorable," "your Reverence," &c. They wish to be looked up to as a superior order of beings; they are to be considered as patterns of piety, charity and benevolence; they profess to be the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, who had not where to lay his head; pretend to believe in his gospel, which requires them to love their fellow men as they do themselves; to do unto all men as they would that all men should do unto them. But these requirements they totally disregard; when we ask for bread, which the labor of our own hands has alone produced an abundance for all, they give us a stone, a kick, perhaps a knock on the head.

When we ask for our just rights only, we are caged in a dungeon, doomed to drag out a miserable existence in solitude and wretchedness. This has actually taken place in this enlightened age, in this boasted land of liberty, under a government professed to be based upon the principle that the only just rights to govern a people are derived from the consent of those to be governed.

All that those persecuted victims of power and cruelty asked for, was permission to deposite their votes in the ballot box, which, in justice, they had as good right to do, as they had to breathe the atmosphere. This is the way these self-styled Christians and friends of *law and order* carry out into practice the benevolent and equalizing pre-

cepts of the gospel. These are the men who prate about justice, honesty and integrity, and strictly require it of us, while, at the same time, they set us such fearful examples!

Mr. Paley tells us, (vol. 3, page 54,) that "there must be some very important advantages to account for the existence of institutions, which, in the view just given of them, [by himself,] are so *paradoxical* and *unnatural!*" Listen! *paradoxical* and *unnatural!!* Truly said. This candid admission is more than we ought to have expected; but, inasmuch as he has made it, we are in no way disposed to deprive him of the credit of it. But those very *important* advantages which are to be derived from the existence of such "*paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*," what are they? Yes, what are they? Let these learned gentlemen of legal lore answer for themselves.

Mr. Blackstone tells us, that the primary and principal objects of the law are to determine *rights* and *wrongs*. (Page 122.)

By the rights, as we understand him, he means the powers and privileges of the rich, whether they be usurped, vested or delegated, which, in plain English, means the defences and legal protection they have surrounded themselves with, by the means of which they can sit in security, while they violate the rights of their fellow men with impunity, and in perfect security. There is some advantage in this, to be sure; but the advantage is all on one side—for the rich and powerful only.

The wrongs, we understand to mean the suffering, the poverty, degradation, misery and wretchedness of the poor, by being plundered of their rights.

Those very "important advantages" which the poor derive from the existence of those "paradoxical and unnatural institutions," would be very difficult to discover.

However, Mr. Colquhoun, a celebrated English writer on Political Economy, throws some light on the subject, by saying, that "Poverty is the source of wealth; for without it (poverty) there could be no *riches*, no *refinement*, no *comfort*, no *enjoyment*."

Tillers of the soil, working men of every grade and condition, *do you hear?* or are you still sleeping and slumbering? If you are, it is high time to awake. *Say, do you hear?* Do you hear what these self-styled friends of law and order say to you? You that create all the wealth of

the world, by the labor of your hands alone, at the expense of much blood and toil, *do you hear?* Listen! They tell you this: that they, the precious, cunning, crafty, knowing few, (who, in nature and reality, are no better than yourselves,) may obtain riches, refinement, comfort and enjoyment, and it is absolutely necessary that you, and your children (though naturally entitled to the same rights as themselves,) must be reduced to poverty, to want, to misery and ragged wretchedness; you and your little ones we condemn to everlasting toil; though you supply us with abundance, and much more than we can possibly consume, yet you shall retain for yourselves only what is sufficient to keep life in your bodies, just so long as we may choose to make use of you: we have the power to force you to it, and will be obeyed.

Well, the decree was sent forth to the world; the mandate of the self-styled friends of law and order have been obeyed; the object is obtained; those "very important advantages" are realized, for which those *paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions* it was so desirable to foster and perpetuate, are completely accomplished; and the present unenviable and unhappy condition of the civilized world, (England, more especially,) is the blessed and unenviable fruits of this obedience.

Well, what are the fruits? A select few in possession of all the land, all the wealth of the country; rioting in gorgeous splendor, pefectly overburdened with the good things of life; uttering the everlasting cry of *income, income, income;* the more they get, the less are they satisfied; the more they are fed, the more ravenous they become; still the cry is *more income, more income, more income;* and when they have grasped the whole, their avarice is still unsatisfied; still they cry *give us more,* no matter at what sacrifice of the blood and toil of their fellow men, whom they are required to love as they do themselves.

On the other hand, we see the poor toiling and starving in the midst of plenty, and that abundance created by their own labor and toil: whilst they have made others rich, themselves have become poor; willing to labor still, their masters not being able to make profit on it, because the wealth already made cannot be consumed: we behold a nation, in want, that is sufficiently able to furnish the world with clothing, containing four millions of paupers.

The great mass of the working class are found living in cellars and garrets, huddled together like swine; tenants of jails, or inmates of poor houses; crime on the fearful increase: in short, a nation full of *riches* and *misery*, *crimes* and *splendor*. Such, then, are the "very important advantages" to be obtained by perpetuating those "very *paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*" put forth to the world by Blackstone, Paley & Co., for the good government of mankind.

For a more graphic and statistical account of the workings of this most beautiful theory of government, read Lester's "Condition and Fate of England," in which the results of its operations are portrayed by a masterly hand, and with such feelings of humanity and benevolence, as can only be experienced by those who have studied the nature of human rights, and whose breasts are full of the milk of human kindness.

Now, fellow citizens, you have had the advantages of miscalled civilization laid before you, and a loathsome picture it is. Working men, are you willing to give the price asked for it?

What is the price?

The price is the surrender of your dearest rights, your inalienable birthright in the soil, your right to possess and enjoy the fruits of your own industry; in short, give up every prerogative which constitutes *The Man!* aye, give up your very manhood, and become the pliant, abject, crouching, cringing slaves to all absorbing, monopolizing, gormandizing, all-consuming *Capital*, whose everlasting cry is *income, income, more income.*

Are you willing to pay the price? Working men, this is for you to decide. Income to capital, is the fruits of the poor man's toil and labor, and capital is the poor man's labor unconsumed, past labor concentrated, nothing more.

In view of all these considerations, we would ask this solemn question:

Had Satan himself been summoned from the infernal regions, (imbued with all the deadly hatred and fiendish malignity which we are told he cherishes for the human race,) and commissioned to devise a scheme to fill the world with crime and misery, and set mankind to pulling and tearing each other to pieces, could he have hit on a plan better calculated to do it, than those "*paradoxical* and

unnatural institutions," which Blackstone, Paley & Co., have given to the world for its government?

Mr. Paley further tells us, without a blush, that all these "*paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*" are in perfect accordance with the will of God! O, shame, where is thy blush? Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon.

Where did Mr. Paley get this knowledge from? Surely, not from the Bible, as that is decidedly against him. The king must have told him; he (the king) being the only legitimate head of the Church; consequently, none but himself could be the true expounder of God's will. But had Mr. Paley never read the Bible? did he not remember reading about that first great law given to all mankind through Adam—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread, till thou return unto the ground?" Whether Mr. Paley was unconscious that he was writing down a falsehood, or was obliged to succumb to the king, or forfeit a good fat living, would, perhaps, be difficult to tell. One thing, however, is certain. Mr. Paley has spent much time and talent in showing how this universal law may be set aside, or reversed, in favor of a cunning, knowing few, who not only eat bread, but luxuriate to depletion on all the extravagant delicacies that human ingenuity ever invented, and, besides, monopolize, waste and squander, in idle pomp and splendor, the wealth of the world: not in the sweat of their own faces, but in that of other men; and this they do with as much sang froid as the infant takes its mother's milk!

We shall summon one more witness against Mr. Paley, from the Bible; one whose authority is irresistible, being reputed the wisest man the world ever knew. After taking his testimony, we shall suffer Mr. Paley to rest in peace. "There is nothing better for a man, than *that he should eat and drink, and to enjoy the good of all his labor, all the days of his life*, which God giveth him, for it is his portion: this is the gift of God."

What a pity it is, that those blighting, "*paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*," by which the world has been hitherto governed, should be forever turning into curses all the best and most valuable gifts of God to man.

Now we would ask, will any man in the present day, who is a teacher in goodness and truth, a lover of God and

the human race, have the hardihood to so insult the common sense of mankind, dishonor the God of humanity, and prostitute the sacred name of Justice, as to vindicate, justify or support such "*paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*," which produce such sin and wickedness, vice and crime, misery and wretchedness, among mankind? We most fervently hope not. But should any one have the temerity to do so, let him take counsel of Isaiah, the prophet, and carefully count the cost:

"Hear ye the words of the Lord, ye rulers. Wo unto them that join house to house; that lay field to field, till there is no place [for the poor.] Your rulers are rebellious, and companions of thieves; every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards; they judge not the fatherless rightly, neither doth the cause of the widow come up before them. Wo unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; and put sweet for bitter, and bitter for sweet.

"The Lord will enter into judgment with the teachers of his people, and the rulers thereof; for ye have eaten up the vineyard, and the spoil of the poor is in your houses.

"What mean ye, that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of hosts.

"Wo unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and write that grievousness which they have prescribed: To turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey, that they may rob the fatherless.

"Wo unto them which justify the wicked, for a reward, [income, or salary,] and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him."

With this lesson from Holy Writ, we shall leave such an one to the operation of his own conscience, and in the hands of his God. Let him choose his own course; we clear our own skirts of responsibility; we have done our duty.

There is another favorite fundamental principle laid down by the friends of law and order; that is, those benevolent gentlemen who take such pleasure in making laws for the government of such of their fellow men as are too ignorant to govern themselves. It is as follows:

In order that men, in a state of society, may enjoy the benefits resulting from institutions of civil government, it

is necessary that individuals give up a portion of their natural and unalienable rights; in return for which, it becomes the duty of government to afford its protection.

Now, it seems to us, that, if justice had any hand in the business, the amount of protection would be proportionate to the amount of the rights given up; and said protection would be awarded to those individuals who had thus surrendered up their rights. Would this be anything more than fair and just? Certainly not. It is not possible to come to any other conclusion, the thing is so self-evident. But is this the case? Let us inquire,

First. *What* are the rights given up for protection? and by *whom* are they given up?

Second. What is the proporton secured in exchange for the rights so given up? and *who* gets this protection?

What natural rights do king's nobles, landlords, capitalists, officers of government, &c., give up? Do they give up their right to land? No! They monopolize the whole of it. Do they give up their right to the products of their own labor? No! They never make any; how can they give them up? What right, then, do they give up? None whatever, except that of eating their bread in the sweat of their own faces. We might, at least, give them credit for that: let them have it. In fact, the rich give up none; no, not one.

But, what natural rights do the poor give up, or, rather, are taken from them without their consent? or, if we call things by their proper names, are robbed of everything calculated to make life desirable? They are robbed of their birthright in the soil; plundered of the fruits of their industry, as fast as created by them, leaving only a sufficiency to make life a curse, instead of a blessing. Take away man's right to the free use of the land, and the fruits of his toil, and he has no further business in this world: better had he never been born.

Having shown what rights are given up, and by whom, our next inquiry is, Is the protection proportionate to the rights given up? As the rich and noble of the land have given up *none* of their rights, what amount of protection are they entitled to? Justice and common sense say, none; not a bit. But the fact is, they get all. Give up *nothing—monopolize everything.*

As we have shown that the poor give up everything,

they are justly entitled to a large portion of protection. But do they get it? By no means. They get none of it, save and except from absolute brute force and cruelty; and this is but nominal, because the privilege of committing any crime whatever, even to murder, (as the proceedings of our courts have often proved,) can be purchased with money, by those who possess a sufficient amount. The poor man, not being suffered to have any to spare for this purpose, is obliged to go minus the privilege.

The sum of the whole matter is this: The rich give up none of their rights, and get all of the protection; while the poor give up all their rights, and get none of the protection. That was a very sensible conclusion of Mr. Paley's, that these institutions were very *paradoxical* and *unnatural*. Very. Truly has the law been made like a spider's web: the little flies (the poor and defenceless,) are caught in the toils, and suffer death; while the big bugs (the rich and powerful,) break through and escape; then laugh and chuckle at the ingenuity of the contrivance.

God made man upright, at the first; but he hath sought out many surprising, cunning, cruel, and artful inventions, by which he might deprive his fellow man of his dearest and most sacred rights.

But the most surprising thing of all, is, to find, at this late day, in this boasted land of liberty, men of talent and discernment advocating, supporting and justifying this unjust system of law and order, which is so *paradoxical* and *unnatural*. Give us laws, but let them be just. Working men, your task is to remove these paradoxical and unnatural institutions. You have the power; you have the ballot-box, and can put them down without doing injustice to any.

But be calm and prudent, yet firm and unyielding; stand up manfully for the truth; convince our adversaries of the justice of our cause, and the purity of our motives. If they revile us, let us not revile again; treat them with courtesy and politeness; appeal to their best feelings of humanity, not the evil passions; nor in any way or manner excite their combativeness. This we must do, if we wish to succeed, as everything like violence, or force, is only calculated to impede the progress of our operations. A very profitable lesson may be learned from that inimitable fable of Æsop's, in which he tells us of the dispute be-

tween the Sun and the Wind, as to which was the stronger. They agreed to try their efforts upon a traveler who was passing along, wrapped up in a cloak. The wind blew, and bespattered the traveler with rain, snow and hail; and the more the wind blew and stormed, the closer the traveler drew the cloak around him. At length the wind became weary, and ceased his efforts. The sun now broke out in silent splendor, and, by the genial warmth of his rays, soon compelled the traveler to throw off his cloak and seek shelter under the cooling shade of some trees. The application is as follows: The traveler is the embodiment of those paradoxical and unnatural institutions of law and order, promulgated by Blackstone, Paley & Co. The cloak is the sophistry and mysticism they have thrown around their idol, for the purpose of hiding its hideous deformity. The sun and wind are the different modes of attack. We shall vanquish our enemies soonest, by following the example of the sun.

The only object and end of government ought to be, to *promote the happiness of all its subjects, or members*, by affording its protection *equally* to *all*. For any other purpose, government is worse than useless. This proposition no one will deny, can deny; it is so self-evident; and may be laid down as an axiom. And this we shall do, without fear of refutation.

If a government fail to secure to each and all its subjects, or members, the enjoyment of their natural and unalienable rights, so far, then, government fails to do its duty; and, to the same extent, is a vicious, unjust, unrighteous government; but more especially so, if it violates them; and, in a strictly moral sense, the people are under no obligation to obey its mandates, as resistance to tyranny is obedience to God; legalizing tyranny never can make it just or right.

We may be told, that these sentiments are very dangerous. We answer, if they are, then *that* code of law laid down by Blackstone, Paley & Co., is much more so.

That a knowledge of truth can be dangerous, we unhesitatingly deny; save and except to such as are engaged in false, wicked and unrighteous pursuits, or practices.

It may be asked, who is to be the judge, when men disagree? When our rights are clearly defined, (as they are in this work,) a jury would find but little difficulty in mak-

ing proper decisions, and take *them* for their guide; especially when they lay aside those paradoxical and unnatural institutions which have been imposed upon us by Blackstone, Paley, and their legal abettors and upholders, connected as they are with the common law of England.

Mr. Paley, notwithstanding his paradoxical and unnatural institutions, says some good things. With regard to right of property in land, he says: "There is a difficulty in explaining the origin of this property consistently with the law of nature; for the land was once, no doubt, common; and the question is, how any part of it could be *justly* taken out of the common, and so appropriated to the first owner, [or occupier,] as to give him a better right to it than others, and, what is more, a right to exclude all others," and, also, to transmit the ownership through a particular line of succession, to distant and unknown ages; as if our predecessors knew better how to take care of us, than we do ourselves. What an absurdity! "Moralists," says he, "have given many different accounts of this matter, *which diversity alone*, perhaps, is a *proof* that none of them are *satisfactory*. Our obligations to servants and domestics is much greater than theirs to us. It is a mistake to suppose that the rich man maintains his servants, tradesmen, tenants and laborers: the truth is, *they maintain him*. It is their industry which supplies his table, furnishes his wardrobe, builds his houses, adorns his equipage, and provides his amusements. It is not the estate, but the labor employed upon it, that pays his rent. All that he does, is to distribute what others produce, which is the least part of the business." Even the physical part of this operation is performed by the labor of other hands, not his own.

The above correct sentiments we quote in justice to Mr. Paley, and contain, perhaps, as much truth as he dare impart, surrounded as he was by kings and nobles, whose powers and privileges he was obliged to defend.

We now render the same justice to Mr. Blackstone, (vol. 2, page 53.) He says: "The grand fundamental maxim of all feudal tenure is this: that all lands were originally granted out by the sovereign, and are, therefore, holden, either mediately or immediately, of the crown," (as property.) This is a plain statement. The king was considered as rightful owner of all the land in his kingdom, as private property; as though it was the work of his hands,

having the right to sell for money, or service, or to give to whomsoever he chose. On page 51, he says: "This view of the matter, though a fundamental maxim, is, in reality, a *mere fiction*." Yet the fictious idea was carried out in practice, as though based upon truth; the king gave or sold all the land, except what he reserved for himself, to a select few; and ordained the penalty of death for any landless person to dispute the justice of the title.

No wonder these gentlemen took such good care of themselves, when no one had power to prevent them No wonder the many have become enslaved by the few, when such principles are taken as the guide of our American legislators. It is upon the above named fiction, that a majority of the land titles in this country still rests; especially in the eastern states; the strongest, clearest, and most indisputable titles are those in which the claimant can produce a parchment, proving a grant or sale, under the hand and seal of his royal majesty, the king of Great Britain!

But is it not strange and unaccountable, that at this late day, after having the Declaration of Independence before us for three score and ten years, which declares to the world that all men's rights are equal, that men shall be found among *us Americans*, (who profess to believe in the doctrine of equal rights, and the principles of the Christian religion, which commands them to do unto all men as they would that all men should do unto them, taking so short-sighted a view of their own permanent interest, sacrificing the rights, good feelings, and respect of their fellow citizens,) promoting, abetting, advocating and sustaining, with the greatest tenacity, by the exercise of the most splendid talent and learning, the most flowery and captivating eloquence, cunning and sophistical arguments, such paradoxical and unnatural institutions, founded, as Mr. Blackstone tells us they are, on the "baseless fabric" of a "*mere fiction?*"

The following are Mr. Blackstone's reflections on the nature of property in general:

"There is nothing which so generally strikes the imagination, and engages the affections of mankind, as the right of property, or that sole and despotic dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion

of the right of any other individual in the universe. And yet there are very few, that will give themselves the trouble to consider the origin and foundation of this right. Pleased as we [the rich] are with the possession, *we* seem afraid to look back to the means by which it was acquired, as if *fearful of some defect in the title*. Such fearful and troublesome reflections can never haunt the poor, which ought, in some measure, to console them.

Or at best, we rest satisfied with the decision of the laws in *our* favor [as they always are,] without examining the reason or authority upon which those laws have been built. *We* think it enough that our title is derived by the grant of the former proprietor, by descent from our ancestors, or by the last will and testament of the dying owner, not caring to reflect, that, accurately and strictly speaking, there is no foundation in nature or in natural law, why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land, or why the son should have a right to exclude his fellow creatures from a determinate spot of ground, because his father had done so before him; or why the occupier of a particular field, or of a jewel, when lying on his death-bed, and no longer able to maintain possession, should be entitled to tell the rest of the world, which of them should enjoy it after him. These enquiries, it must be owned, would be useless, and even troublesome, in common life. It is well if the mass of mankind [*that is, the poor*,] will obey the laws when made, without *scrutinizing too nicely* into the reasons of making them. But when law is to be considered not only as matter of practice [no matter how paradoxical or unnatural,] but also as a *rational science*, [heaven save the mark,] it cannot be improper or useless to examine more deeply the rudiments and grounds of these positive constitutions of society."

Well done, Mr. Blackstone! A rational science founded and built on mere *fiction!!* Truly, well done! Who could have done it more satisfactorily?

Mr. Blackstone now takes another turn in his reflections, and says:

"In the beginning of the world, we are informed by Holy Writ, the all-bountiful Creator gave to man dominion over all the earth, and over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. This is the only true and solid foundation of man's dominion over external things, whatever airy metaphysical notions may have been started by some fanciful writers on the subject. The earth, therefore, and all things therein, are the general property of all mankind, from the *immediate gift of the Creator*. And while the earth continued not

densely populated, it is reasonable to suppose, that all was in common among them, and that every one took from the public stock, to his own use, such things as his immediate necessities required Thus, the land was in common, and no part of it was the permanent property of any man in particular; yet, whoever was in possession or occupation of any determinate spot of it, acquired, for the time, a sort of ownership, from which it would have been unjust, and contrary to the law of nature, to have driven him away by force; but, when he quitted the use or occupation of it, another might take possession of it, without injustice to any one."

Here, then, we pause to inquire, why did not our original law-makers follow out this simple, natural principle, so easily to have been accomplished, so just and natural in itself, by making a law something like this: That the fact of a man having property on any part of the land that he had not taken forcible possession of, or had improved it, in any manner, by the labor of his hands, should give him an indisputable title to its possession, just so long as he chose to occupy it, and no longer, always preserving a distinction between the land itself, and the property upon it; it also being made the duty of government to protect and secure every man in this most sacred, just, natural and unalienable right? Had they done this, what rivers of blood, what oceans of tears, and ages of misery, had been saved the human race! Why did they abandon this just and sacred equitable code of laws, and give us, in its stead, those "*paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*," which, Mr. Blackstone says, are based upon *mere fiction?* Yes, why did they do this? Mr. Colquhoun is ready to answer: Because, had they done so, a select few could not have been enabled to riot in idleness and riches, to waste and squander, in useless pomp and splendor, the fruits of the poor man's toil and labor. Neither could the mass of mankind, the great majority, have been reduced to bondage, slavery, vassallage, ignorance, want, poverty, crime, misery and wretchedness! Poverty being the source of riches, *we could not enjoy those enviable blessings.*

We have now done with these very benevolent and disinterested gentlemen, and turn our attention to the means of extricating ourselves from the difficulties brought upon us by those "*paradoxical* and *unnatural institutions*," which unjustly, unfeelingly and unrighteously have been imposed upon us. The probability is, those gentlemen never would

have given this evil-working code of laws to the world, had they have clearly seen what was to be the ultimate result of its operation. There is much excuse for them, also, on the ground that they were ignorant of the power of steam, and the improvements to be made in labor-saving machinery. They did not know that a nation would be enabled, by these means, to produce from five to ten times as much wealth as it would consume; or, perhaps, if they did see the truth, they were surrounded by such circumstances, that they dare not tell it. As those gentlemen have long since gone to the silent tomb, let us hope they rest in peace, though their errors we can in no wise tol erate.

Instead of founding our scheme on the basis of a mere "fiction," as Mr. Blackstone says our present system of land tenure is, we propose to base it upon a *real, solid natural foundation, a positive tangible fact—the public lands of the United States*, according to the plan adopted by the National Reformers; which plan is to prevent all future traffic in the public lands; instead of which, to give to every citizen a homestead (that is, all who choose to take it,) from the public domain, and, so long as he continues to be an actual settler upon it, government to secure him in its possession, and make it unalienable, giving him the liberty to sell or exchange his improvements upon it; but this in no case, except to a landless person; the land itself never to be confounded with property upon it—land itself, *not* being a product of *human labor*, cannot, in justice, be valued by money, *which is*.

It is not necessary to enter into all the details of the subject, in this place, for if the reader clearly understands the fundamental principles already discussed, he must at once perceive the obvious necessity of the measure: of its practicability, there can be no doubt. The benefits to be derived from it, to the working classes, will be incalculable. In the first place, it will lessen competition among the working classes, by drawing many from the cities into the country, which will have the effect to enable those that remain to get better wages. In the next place, it will have a tendency to lessen the price of land held by speculators, and, in proportion as the free land cause progresses forward, land speculation, which is a blighting curse on our country, will go backward. This cause is, emphatically,

the working man's; it is his only means of defence against the all-absorbing, gormandizing influence of capital.

Let us, then, one and all, unite in this great moral work of reform, and insist upon the justice of our cause. All we ask is our just rights. We ask nothing for ourselves, that we are not perfectly willing to grant to all. If we are wrong in this, we hope and trust kind Heaven will forgive us; if it be wicked to vindicate the cause of the oppressed and defenceless, then do we glory in our wickedness.

CHAPTER III.

AAMERIAN AUTHORS ON POLITICAL ECONOMY EXAMINED.

It is a lamentable fact, and no less true than astonishing, that, among all American writers on Political Economy, not one is to be found that has not sacrificed every consideration of justice and equity; every ennobling, heart-warm feeling of humanity; every idea of equal rights; every virtue; in short, everything that ought to dignify, elevate and adorn the human character; to the interests of sordid, selfish, all-absorbing, gormandizing *Capital.*

The working man whose necessities compel him to labor, or sell himself for wages, (having been deprived of his birthright in the soil,) has been considered, by said writers, in the same light, and no other, that they look upon a lot of timber in the forest, a bank of clay, or a bed of ore in the bowels of the earth, to be taken up and made use of so long, and no longer, than profit (which means products of other men's labor,) can be made by the use of them. As to a laboring man, having a soul or intellect, being entitled to equal rights with the capitalist, or to the same amount of protection; or that he possessed human capabilities of suffering pain, or enjoying happiness; or that it was the duty of any one to see that he was properly provided and cared for; was as far from their thoughts as would be the idea of providing comfortable quarters for the Alleghaney mountains during the winter season. No; the interests of capital were considered *paramount to every other consideration.*

In proof of our assertion, that the worrking man, if poor, has never been considered in any other light than as a beast of burden, or a useful chattel, placed, by Providence, upon the earth, for the especial use and benefit of the capitalist, we shall quote the great Adam Smith, vol. 1, page 56. He says: "The wear and tear of a slave, it has been said, is at the expense of his master; but that of a free servant is at his own expense. The wear and tear of the *latter*, however, is, in reality, as much at the ex-

pense of his master, as that of the former." Just as much! True; and that is, none at all; but, on the contrary, the master is maintained at the expense of his slaves, or servants. This is self-evident. For authority, we refer the reader to Dr. Paley, page 52: "*The wages paid to journeymen and servants of every kind, must be such as to enable them to continue the race of journeymen and servants, as the demand of society may happen, from time to time, to require!* But, though the *wear and tear* of a free servant be equally at the expense of his master, it generally costs him much less than that of a 'chattel slave!'" In plain, unsophisticated language, it amounts to this: when such animals as journeymen, servants, and laborers, become too numerous; that is, when capitalists have become overstocked and glutted with wealth, and can no longer make a profitable use of the poor wretches, then they must be suffered to perish, they and their little ones, by want, disease, starvation and death, while the surplus of their labor and toil is being wasted by their idle masters, in wanton and useless extravagance. But, when a demand arises for the use of such animals, then the breeding of them ought to be encouraged, and particular care ought to be taken that the breed does not become entirely extinct. Now, here we would ask, in all candor, would it not be much better, on the ground of humanity, in order to rid society of the surplus working classes, to adopt Mr. Ware's plan, and kill them off at once, rather than condemn them to the protracted, painful, lingering death by starvation, which is advocated by some professing Christian moral philosophers! Adam Smith has made one declaration, and, if true, is of much importance to the capitalist, which is, that a nominal free servant, journeyman, or laborer, will answer his purpose much better than a positive slave. That is, he can realize more wealth from the use of him, in a given time, than he can from a chattel slave, and with less risk of capital.

A capitalist finds a thing called a poor man without a home, deprived of his birthright in the soil, reduced to want and destitution, perhaps lying in the street; no matter by what means he got there, this is no business of the capitalist; his schoolmastes have taught him that neither justice, law, religion, or morality, requires him to relieve the miserable creature from his miserable condition, ex-

cept he can make money out of him: he acts accordingly. If he can't think of a plan by which to make money out of him, he lets him lie; but if, on the contrary, he has sufficient talent and discernment to hit on a plan, he picks the poor thing up, and immediately turns him, or it, into a money-making machine, supplies it with a little fuel, (provision) to set it in motion, as he would a steam engine, or any other machine; then the man machine begins to work, and produces two, three, four, perhaps five dollars per day; the whole of which is claimed by the capitalist, on the ground of the expense of the fuel, which is all he is willing to allow, and is all he does allow, for the exclusive use of this man machine. The law and customs of society justify and protect him. This process of dollar-making goes on from day to day, till the machine is worn out, or nearly so; and when the capitalist perceives that it does not turn out quite so many dollars as formerly, he concludes he *can afford* to supply the fuel no longer; he therefore turns him again into the street, where he found him, with as little sympathy or fellow-feeling as he would feel towards a worn out steam engine, and as unceremoniously, too, never reflecting that he is his brother, and entitled to the same rights and enjoyments as himself; and, in return for this inhuman conduct, he requires the gratitude of the poor man, for allowing him to live as long as he has, and the praises and benedictions of society, for thus exercising his generosity!

With what degree of consistency, we would ask, can such a man pretend to believe in the Gospel, which requires him to "do unto others as he would that others should do unto him"? We should like to see the experiment tried, should the tables happen to get turned.

Well, what is to become of the poor man, who is now, in his old age, turned into the street, without money or friends, deprived of his birthright in the soil, and has become an outcast? Again we ask, what is to become of him? We shall bring up Mr. Ware, a southern planter, who wrote "Notes on Political Economy," for the edification of the American people, who pretends to believe in the doctrine of equal rights. At page 195, you will find the following humane passage:

"The moment an individual is *base* and *mean* enough to beg, or avail himself of public charity, he is totally worthless, and sunk beyond all remedy. There is no foundation left, in his case, upon which to build him up; no pride, no self-esteem, no ambition; in short, the person is not a man, but sunk to the level of the brute; not a biting, or venomous brute, but a mere eating brute. It would be to the interest of society, to kill off all such drones, get rid of such excrescences, and cast off such burdens. No religion, no Howard, no helping hand, can raise him one single step in the *scale* of *value* and *availability*."

Observe the words *value* and *availability*. The natural inference to be drawn from the above, appears to be this: that when a man becomes reduced to poverty and destitution, no matter by what means, if he wishes to live, he must, of necessity, do one of three things—beg, steal, or starve—and the worst offence he can commit, is to beg: for this, he ought to be killed.

Now, suppose the poor man should improve upon the hint Mr. Ware gives, in regard to killing—that it would answer a much better purpose for him to kill the capitalist, than let the capitalist kill him—and if it would not "*be to the interest of society to kill off all such drones, get rid of such excrescences, cast off such burdens.*" We should be very sorry, indeed, should working men undertake to carry into practice Mr. Ware's inhuman suggestion, though it would be but a natural consequence; but there is no necessity for it. Restore to man his right to the soil, allow him but the fruits of his toil, and he will no longer be a burden upon the capitalist. He asks for no favors; he only contends for justice, simple justice: give him *but this*, and he will want no poor-house provision, neither the mercy, generosity, charity, or benevolence, from the capitalist.

From the foregoing remarks, let all writers on this subject learn a salutary lesson, and be cautious as to the sentiments they disseminate in books; as, from the moment of publication, they become public property. Perhaps, if the gentleman had perceived the full bearing of his declaration, he would not have said what he did.

Mr. Wayland, in considering the cost of producing a *laborer*, speaks of him precisely in the same manner as he would were he speaking of raising cattle, and considers him in the same light. After summing up the items of his

observations, he concludes thus, page 293: "The lowest price at which the labor of any animal can be procured, is the cost of rearing him, and of maintaining him in health and *vigor*." Mr. Wayland at page 31, in arranging Capital under proper heads, seems much puzzled to find the proper place for land, but finally concludes to place it along with ploughs, harrows, spades, carts, and working animals, and, as he makes no distinction, in a political point of view, between bipeds and quadrupeds, in this case he meant both. In assigning a proper place for land, he qualifies his declaration with a "perhaps"—he did not know certain. One would naturally be led to suppose he had received his education in Russia. The title of Mr. Wayland's book is as follows:

"Elements of Political Economy, by Francis Wayland, D. D., President of Brown University, and Professor of *Moral Philosophy*. 1845."

One more quotation from Mr. Wayland. At page 130, he says: "As a stimulus to intellectual improvement, probably the right of suffrage should be restricted to those who are able to read and write." So, then, if society has been unjust to a portion of its members, by failing to give them that education to which they are justly entitled, this reverend gentleman advises, that insult, indignity and degradation be added to previous injustice, by depriving them of their very manhood! This, too, under a government professing to derive its authority alone from the consent of the governed. Does an individual forfeit his relationship to the great family of Man, merely because others have not taught him how to read and write? For this misfortune, ought he to be ostracised? Mr. Wayland says he ought!

From all that has been quoted from American authors on Political Economy, it must be perfectly evident to all, that they, one and all, have never considered the man who is obliged, by his destitution, to sell himself for wages, in any other view, than as convenient and useful materials and instruments, sent, by Providence, for the express purpose of building up and promoting the short-sighted interest of the unfeeling, world-grasping capitalist. As to their having the common rights of humanity, and the feelings

of human beings, has never entered into their calculations, notwithstanding we have had the "Declaration of Independence" before us these seventy years, which emphatically declares, that all men's rights are equal; all of them well understanding, that the poorer a man is, the easier it is to deprive him of the fruits of his labor.

If we analyze all the orthodox systems of Political Economy, and reduce them to their simple elements, we are inevitably forced to the conclusion, that, if the writers had given titles to their works, in accordance with the principles and doctrines laid down in them, they would have been something like the following:

POLITICAL ECONOMY:

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE

KING AND THE CAPITALIST:

OR,

How we, the *Rich* may bind, in perpetual slavery, the great majority of mankind, and cause them to supply us with all the comforts, luxuries and vanities of life, with the greatest success, and with perfect security to ourselves. And, also, when they have produced more wealth than we know how to dispose of, or what to do with, how to starve them to death, out of our way, how to "cast off such burdens, get rid of such excrescences," and yet be good and virtuous;

BY MALTHUS, COLQUHOUN, SMITH, SAY, BLAKE, WARE, AND MANY OTHERS.

Furthermore, the elements of criminal law may, with the same propriety, all be condensed into the following brief appellation:

CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE:

OR,

How the Rich can keep the Poor and defenceless in *proper* subjection, while suffering under the cruel treatment of their illustrious and dignified Lords and Masters;

BY LAW AND ORDER.

Producers of wealth! this is the true statement of the case, in a nut-shell: we give you author and page, and, therefore, challenge a refutation.

Well may such institutions be termed "*paradoxical* and *unnatural*." Working men! producers of wealth! it is your task to abolish them, and introduce a state of justice, by promoting *National Reform!*

We would naturally suppose, from the principles inculcated by Political Economists, that they had profited much by the study of Dame Lobkins' instruction to Paul Clifford, which runs something like this:

"Mind thy kittychism, child, and reverence old age. Never steal, 'specially when anybody be in the way. Never go snacks with them as be older than you,—'cause why? The older a cove be, the more he cares for his self, and the less for his partner. Read your Bible, and talk like a pious 'un. People goes more by your words, than your actions. If you wants what is not your own, try and do without it; and, if you can't do without it, take it by insinivation, not bluster. 'Cause they as only swindles, *does more* and *risks less* than they as robs outright; and, if you cheats toppingly, you may laugh at the topping cheat (gallows.) Now, go play; but here, take some money in your pocket, and don't play for nothing; it's loss of time; but mind, always play with them as be less than yourself, and then, if they says you go for to cheat, you can go for to beat 'em."*

* Bulwer.

CHAPTER IV.

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL ROBBERY COMPARED.

Previous to proceeding further, it is necessary to clear up a difficulty in respect to compulsory human action, which, in reality, cannot possibly exist, because no man can make another do an *act* which he *will not do:* he must *will* before he can *act*. This is so plain, that none need err, as every one may convince himself, by appealing to his own experience: he will find that the *will* is the cause of the *act*. Therefore, if he performs the least voluntary act, it must be in accordance with the will, or *willingly*. Suppose a robber meets a defenceless man on the highway, and demands his purse; at the same time, presents a pistol: the man, perhaps, hesitates, but presently deliberately hands it over to the robber, *thinking* it better to lose his purse, than his life; the mental conclusion he comes to, being the *motive* which causes the will to produce the muscular act of handing over the purse. In this case, there is no positive compulsion; the robber has only given him the choice of two evils—the man choosing the least, as a matter of course, or what he thinks the least evil at the time. This is all the kind of compulsory action that can exist, or approximate towards it.

Let us suppose, in the case above, that the man should complain of the injustice of the act; the robber might answer thus: I have the power, therefore the right; you happen to be weak and defenceless; I happen to be armed, and can protect myself, and, as you cannot defend yourself, you must submit to the terms which I dictate: you ought not complain; because, if you have ingenuity enough to make, or money to buy a pistol, you can do as I do—rob others, and get your money back again; you have the same right that I have. Now, what would an honest man think of such reasoning? Would he not be shocked? Would he not pronounce it perfect sophistry? Besides this, what kind of consolation could an honest man derive from the consideration, that, if he could only get a

pistol, he might rob others, on the ground that himself had been robbed! Ought such consideration reconcile him to the injustice of the outrage? Surely not. Let men of honest feeling answer.

The reasoning of the robber is similar to that of the capitalist: the difference, which is slight, will be shown presently.

Suppose A should meet B in a solitary place; A has a pistol, but destitute of money or bread; B has three dollars in his pocket; A says, deliver your money, presenting the pistol, and thereby putting B in fear of a sudden death, but who, rather than suffer, is *willing* to part with his purse. In common language, we would call this compulsion; yet, in reality, it is only choosing between two evils. Let us suppose, further, that B remonstrates, and says, do not rob me entirely, or I shall be ruined; I shall want for bread. A then sympathizes with B, and finally takes but two dollars, leaving him one to sustain him on his journey. This kind of transaction A performs each day in succession, but every day finds a new victim. Again suppose: C, having all the comforts of life in abundance, much more than he can consume, finds D in a ditch, unable to get out, in fear of starvation, and begs C to help him out. What will you pay me? says C. I have nothing to pay with, which is the reason that I am lying here, answers D. Can you spin out dollars? and how many can you spin out in a day? D answers, I can spin out three dollars a day; but I have nothing to buy fuel with, to set me in motion. Well, my good fellow, says C, if you will set yourself to work, and spin out three dollars a day, (but mind, all the dollars are mine, except the cost of the fuel which is necessary to keep you in motion,) I will have the generosity to help you out. Well, the poor fellow, after considering the matter over, and being in fear of a painful, lingering death by starvation, rather than suffer which, is willing to accept C's terms. In this case, there is as much compulsory action as there is in the case of A and B, with but this difference: A runs some risk in challenging B, because he does not know whether he is armed or not, until he tries the experiment. Again he runs a great risk in regard to the law: he also well knows that B has a remedy, in law, against him. To meet these dangers, it is necessary to evince a spirit of enterprize and courage: in fact, it re-

quires some bravery. In both cases, the victims suffer the loss of the same amount of property; but A's victim goes on his way rejoicing, while, on the other hand, C's victim is consigned to everlasting slavery, without hope of redemption. In both cases, they are conquered by the fear of death: in B's case, the fear of death is produced, at the time, by the courage and bravery of his conquerer; but in D's case, the fear of death has been produced as certainly by his conquerer, as in the case of B, but in a different manner, to wit: by C's influence in contriving those paradoxical and unnatural institutions, which were intended to consign him to the ditch. Our paradoxical and unnatural institutions of society consign A to a dungeon, and to C they award riches, honor, dignity and respect. Why these decisions? we ask. Is A condemned for his courage and bravery, and for risking his life to get bread; and C rewarded for his cowardly treason, in laying secret and unseen contrivances to bring his victim to the fear of death, though he is himself in want of nothing? for this appears to be all the real difference in the two cases. If these be the true grounds of the decisions, Mr. Paley may well call such institutions "*paradoxical* and *unnatural*."

We contend that this is no overdrawn picture: it is true to experience, and such characters abound in all civil communities. We now ask every honest man that has any regard for the attributes which adorn and dignify human nature, which of these two characters is the most of a *Man*, and is most worthy of our trust and respect? A, the robber, or C, the capitalist? We let others decide.

CHAPTER V.

SLAVERY TO CAPITAL.

A very interesting piece of intelligence lately appeared in the public papers, entitled "First Men of Boston," setting forth, that 142 persons were in possession of $12,604,000, to which we add John Jacob Astor, of New York. Then we have 143 persons owning forty-two millions five hundred and three thousand and five hundred dollars. This sum, divided equally among the whole, will give $29,723 apiece; but, for the convenience of round numbers, we will assume $30,000 each.

Now, what is the object of this announcement? Is it to show the great prosperity of the country, and the growing happiness of the people? Perhaps it is. If so, then we should like if some of those gentlemen who understand the subject, would show us in what way the happiness of the mass of the people is promoted by concentrating so much wealth in the hands of so few persons. We are decidedly at a loss: it is a mystery to us. However, we will endeavor to solve this seeming mystery.

No capitalist in this country is satisfied with less than 6 per cent. interest on his capital; and if he could not, at least, get this, he would imagine that beggary was staring him in the face, no matter what might be his possessions. He would consider it a certain indication of the speedy dissolution of all earthly things; much more so than Miller's prophecy of the end of the world.

The interest on five thousand dollars is three hundred. With this sum, a capitalist will be enabled to supply with fuel one man-money-making-machine, (taking women into the account,) for one year. Now, this human machine is virtually and positively as much a slave to the capitalist, as any chattel slave is to his master; in either case, they are controlled by the will of their masters, in all their actions, with this difference: the hired slave can leave his master; but, if he does, he runs the risk of finding another, which is often very difficult to accomplish; still he wants

fuel, or bread; he must have a master: the chattel slave can run away; so that the servitude, as far as effects are involved, are alike compulsory in both cases, and the difference is scarcely worth a straw. In neither case would the victims consent to part with the produce of their own labor, if they could help it, except for an equivalent; but the masters, having virtually made the laws, have taken good care to protect themselves from violence, while they commit the injustice.

From what has just been said, it must be evident to all, that the capitalist, for every five thousand dollars he has invested, virtually owns or controls a slave, whom he purchases daily with the interest, which costs him nothing, being solely produced by other men's labor; so that, in reality, the capitalist never virtually pays for anything, not even his personal taxes, strictly speaking. Consequently, any capitalist possessing one million dollars, virtually owns and controls two hundred slaves. All the wealth which is produced by them, he claims as his own, though it costs him nothing; for even the fuel which is necessary to keep these man machines in action, is furnished at the expense of others, which has been fully proved. This being all true and self-evident, the capitalist of thirty millions owns and controls at least six thousand of his fellow beings in perpetual slavery; and this power to enslave does not die with the capitalist, but is transmitted to posterity by the law of inheritance; so that one portion of mankind are born with saddles on their backs, and another portion, ready booted and spurred, to ride them. All this is done, too, in a land of liberty and equal rights, while our Fourth of July orators complain, that the Declaration of Independence has been commented upon so much, that the subject has been completely exhausted. We think it high time they had their eyes open.

Now we should like to know in what manner the happiness of the community is promoted by the existence of these things. Those who know, ought to tell and explain it: the public good requi res it: they are culpable, if they do not do it. But, until they do, we shall stick firmly to our text. "We will not bate a single word, nor take one letter back."

Capital, in its true sense and nature, is no evil, but a good in itself, being nothing more than a concentrated or

compact form of the products of labor still unconsumed, and has an intrinsic and commercial value, like all other products of industry; and, with much propriety, might be called past labor, or the surplus products of labor, saved over and above consumption. We fear no refutation of this declaration: its truth we shall prove clearly, in its proper place. Now, this surplus past labor might, and, in justice, ought to be employed in promoting the prosperity of all the people; but it is not; on the contrary, it is made use of as a terrible engine of oppression.

Therefore, capital, as now employed in the civilized world, in the enslavement of men, is not a blessing, but a blighting curse in the land; it is a grievous canker, that eats out the poor man's substance; it is a vile and loathsome incubus, that corrupts and corrodes the human heart, by making it callous to the sufferings of our fellow men; it is an all-consuming Moloch, to whom has been sacrificed our dearest and most sacred rights; to whom justice, religion and morality have been prostituted; it is the great Juggernaut of civilization, annually immolating its thousands of miserable, helpless victims, by first striking them with poverty, and then starving them to death. In short, all classes of people have been made to bow down, to worship and adore this all-consuming, gormandizing idol.

Working men, will you lay yourselves down under its wheels, and be crushed to death by its ponderous weight, and have your little ones doomed to everlasting poverty? Will you lick the hand that smites you, and hug the chains that fetter you? or will you rise up in the majesty of your strength, and, in the dignity of your manhood, put down this hideous, frightful monster, assert your rights as men, *be free, be happy?* This is for you to decide. If you decide on putting down the monster, promote the *National Reform* cause, and vote the *freedom of the public lands*

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE NATURE OE PROPERTY IN GENERAL.

No error prevalent among men, has produced so much mischief, as that of confounding the products of human industry with the elements and spontaneous productions of nature. Property, wealth, and riches, we consider as synonymous, or mean the same thing. Therefore, property consists of the products of human industry, or those things *only* which man creates, makes, or produces, by the energies of his physical capabilities. The idea of buying and selling the elements of nature with money, is a perfect absurdity. Whatever argument may be brought forward, in support of the practice, will sustain that of chattel slavery, with the same propriety. In fact, it is the foundation of all kinds of slavery. We should like to know upon what just right any man can found his claim to tax his fellow man for the use of that which is not the produce of human exertion, but is the free gift of God to all men in common, and to no man in particular.

The negro slaveholder justifies himself on the ground, that, because the laws of his country are in his favor, and allow him to traffic in human flesh, if he purchase and pay for a negro, he is, therefore, his bona fide property; but these circumstances can never make the transaction just or right, as no man ever did purchase a slave that did not, at the same time, know, that he (the slave) had been stolen. Now we contend that there is as much justice in buying and selling human flesh, as there is in buying and selling land for money. The cases are precisely similar: the one can no more be justified than the other. Mr. Blake says, page 26: "Under bad governments, particular classes [such as landlords and capitalists,] are favored, others discouraged and oppressed: property is thus unequally shared, and wealth unfairly and unjustly distributed." In despotic governments, this is effected by the royal dictum, and the influence of the nobility; in representative governments, by the influence of landlords, slaveholders and capitalists;

and in both, the practice of making land private property, and is the circumstance which enables them chiefly to do so; because, they who own and control the land, *can*, and always have, controlled all other interests. Therefore, we need not be surprised, that kings, nobles, landlords and capitalists, have taken special care of themselves, without regard to the rights of their fellow men.

Mr. Paley says, "nothing ought to be made exclusive property, which can be conveniently engaged in common." It may be convenient, and no doubt is so, for the rich to make land exclusive property; but the convenience to the poor, or a majority of the people, remains yet to be discovered. Mr. Paley further says, "there is a difficulty in explaining the origin of property in land, consistently with the law of nature; for the land was once, no doubt, common, and the question now is, how any particular part of it could be justly taken out of the common, and so appropriated to the first owner, as to give him a better right to it than others, and, what is more, a right to exclude all others from it?" and, we add, by means of a few words on a bit of parchment, convey, through a particular line of succession, that right and title to distant and unknown ages?

These questions, so simple in themselves, and of such vital importance to mankind, unfortunately remain unanswered to the present moment. Where are our Fourth of July orators, that prate about equal rights?—of "the land of the free, and the home of the brave"? And where are the minstrels that sing of the glories of the stars and stripes, and of the star spangled banner that floats in the breeze? Let them cease their soul-stirring oratory, and their heart-soothing melodies; aye, we say, let them close their lips and be dumb; let the joyful sounds no more be heard, while the blighting curse of land monopoly continues to paralyze the arm of industry, and blast the happy prospects of an ought to be free and independent people.

We hope that sufficient has been said to prove positively that land, in no case, can be justly considered as property; and, to conclude this part of the subject, we will quote Mr. Paley, who says: "Moralists have given many different paradoxical and unnatural accounts of this matter, which diversity, alone, is, perhaps, proof that none of them are satisfactory."

It may now be asked, what is property? We answer, the products of labor; nothing else can be.

There are but three ways in which it is possible to become rightly or justly possessed of property. The first is, by making it; the second is, by purchasing, and giving an equivalent for it, (that is, an equal amount of labor;) the third is, by donation or free gift from another, whose property it was. And, as none of these conditions are applicable to ownership of land as property, we shall at once proceed to consider the products of labor. In order that we may not be misunderstood, it is necessary that we explicitly explain our terms.

All the products of labor are susceptible of two kinds of value: first, intrinsic; and second, commercial or exchangable.

Intrinsic value arises from the nature of things themselves, and can be considered only in reference to *the kind and amount of human desires they are, in their natures, capable of gratifying*. This kind of value can have no reference to money whatever, or any other product of labor. Nor can it, in any manner, be estimated or measured by them. Nothing can be more valuable than air to breathe, but this value can never be estimated by any amount of money whatever; therefore, in justice, can never be bought or sold. The same may be said of water, of sunshine, of land, of wild fruits, vegetables, uncaught fish, and whatever lies in a state of nature, in the bowels of the earth, such as minerals, metals, &c., not even excluding gold and silver. This value, therefore, can never be effected or interfered with by anything that man can do, either collectively or individually. Neither can it be valued by money.

Commercial or exchangable value is a different thing altogether, and is dependent principally upon the amount of labor or time required, or actually expended in the production of such things as are the subjects of bargain and sale: in other words, *the cost of production*.

Neglect to preserve a distinction between these two values, has confounded and bewildered all popular writers on the subject of Political Economy. Whether this has been omitted through ignorance or design, is not for us to say; at all events, the world has been filled with mischief, in consequence of the neglect. It is on this value alonef that all commerce ought to be based: to take advantage o,

any other circumstance to *demand* a greater *price*, is but to commit an outrage, and is a gross violation of human rights: in fact, the robber does nothing more than this: he takes another's property, merely because he has the power and the ability to protect himself.

On this point, Mr. Wayland is correct, as far as he goes; but he stops before he gets through, and at the most important point; that is, when he come to money. We shall take up his train of reasoning, and carry it out to the end. He says:

"The degree of exchangable or commercial value of any commodity, depends chiefly upon the amount of labor necessary to create that value. No one would exchange [if he could help it,] what has cost him two days' labor, for that which has cost another man but one day's labor; because, rather than submit to the injustice of making such an exchange, he would create this exchangable value himself. Thus, if a hundred pounds of fish could be procured by one day's labor, and only twenty-five pounds of venison, men would exchange, not pound for pound, but labor for labor; [or time for time; say day for day, or hour for hour,] that is, four pounds of fish for one pound of venison,"

Now, this is all right and just, and we think no one can object to it. A discontinuance of this simple practice, has produced all the evils of which we complain.

Again Mr. Wayland says: "*Cost* forms the standard by which the degree of exchangable value, for long periods of time, [that is to say, the average,] is to be estimated." We contend that this is the *only just view* that can be taken of the products of labor; that is, wealth in all its various forms, whether in provisions, dwellings, clothing, money, instruction, &c.; in short, everything that is produced or performed by human energy. Again Mr. Wayland says:

"Temporary circumstances may create a variation from this standard, and may, for a short time, elevate this value above, or depress it below the *cost*. These, however, can continue to operate but for a short time: the natural tendency of exchangable [commercial] value is always to gravitate towards *cost*.

"Suppose that, by some cause, the supply of fish became more abundant, so that a man could, by one day's labor, procure two hundred pounds, instead of one hundred. The hunter would not be willing to exchange, as before, but would rather catch fish for

himself. He would now demand eight pounds of fish for oen pound of venison: [which would be the equivalents of labor,] in other words, the value or price of fish would fall; that is, the same amount of fish could not procure as much venison as it could before. But as, in consequence of this reduction in price, there would be an increased demand for fish; that is, more persons would want it, and they would also want a larger quantity than before, [being enabled to get it, in exchange, for a less amount of their own labor,] the fisherman would not be obliged to exchange at half the former rate, but would be able to exchange at a rate somewhat above it; say perhaps six or seven pounds for a pound of venison. Thus, both parties would be gainers. The fisherman would procure more venison, and the hunter more fish, by a day's labor. Thus, a benefit to one is a benefit to all. And thus we see, that, [other things being equal,] *the greater the supply* of any article, *the less its commercial value:* that is, the less amount of other things can it procure in exchange."

So reasons Mr. Wayland, and his reasoning is correct; but he should not have stopped here. We may introduce, in place of the fisherman and the hunter, the farmer and shoe-maker, the hatter and watch-maker, the iron-maker and the money-maker; by doing this, we shall perceive, that when any product of labor is what we call cheap, it is an evidence that it is supplied in plenty. We shall perceive, also, if we take into consideration the aggregate of all the products of labor, that the greater the quantity produced in a community in the least space of time, (if this equitable system of commerce is pursued,) the better it is for all; because such consumer gets the greater amount of wealth for his own use, by giving, in exchange, a smaller amount of his own labor. And this is even-handed justice: it is as it ought to be; because every producer, by it, would *accumulate property* in proportion to his industry. And not, as under the prevailing system, do so in proportion as he has power to violate the just rights of others. Also, it must be obvious to all, that, just in proportion as improvements are made in agriculture, the mechanic arts, or in commerce, the greater will be the reward of all who may be engaged in either pursuit. Let this foolish, but fatal error of *property in the elements*, be abolished; let *labor alone* give value to property, whether in its production or distribution, then perfectly free competition, governed alone by the immutable principle of *supply and demand*, we con-

tend, is all that is necessary to bring about that state of things, so ardently desired and looked for, by all good and honest men.

Natural talent being the free gift of God, can have *no relative value* with the products of labor; it should, therefore, be classed with the elements. Acquired talent being the result of expense in instruction, and devotion to study, should be classed with the products of labor, and estimated accordingly.

All that human energy can accomplish in regard to property is, first, produce or create it; second, distribute it; third, consume it. And there are but three ways by which a man can justly become the owner of property. The first is, when he makes, produces, or creates it; the second is, when he purchases it from another, whose it was, by giving an equivalent for it; and the third is, when it is a donation or free gift from another, whose it was. If there be any other just mode of acquiring property, some of our men of talent and learning ought to show what it is. In fact, it is their duty to do so—the public good requires it.

There is a very prevalent disposition in society to awa-d more dignity, importance and consideration to that class who arrogantly style themselves "the business community," that is, those engaged in commerce, than to any other class. In fact, it is imperiously demanded by them, as may be prove-d from many of their published works. In proof of this assertion, we shall select from but one; and that is, an Address to the "Young Men's Mercantile Association of Cincinnati," delivered by Judge Hall, April, 1846. He says:

"It will require but little reflection to satisfy us, that the resources of this country are controlled chiefly by that class, which, in our peculiar phraseology, we term "the business community"—embracing all those who are engaged in the great occupation of buying and selling, exchanging, importing and exporting merchandize, and including the banker, the broker, and the underwriter. I have no hesitation in asserting that they employ more of the wealth, the industry, and the *intellect*, of the American people, *than all other employments and professions united.*

Commerce is limited only by the boundaries of civilized intercourse. It employs the highest energies of the human intellect, and is seen in the most magnificent displays of wealth and power. The vast navies that circumnavigate the globe are hers; great

cities acknowledge her sway; her merchants are *Princes*, the revenues of great and mighty nations are under her control. She is the arbitress of war and peace."

Such are the arrogant claims and pretensions of the commercial or "business community," the money princes of the world, the claims of capital. If these claims are just and right, they ought to be allowed; if not, they ought to be resisted. Those who *produce* all the wealth of the country, set up no such arrogant claims for themselves, and are, therefore, unwilling to allow them to those who only distribute what themselves make or produce. We know of no reason why they should.

Judge Hall thus continues:

"Under the influence of that fell spirit of demagogueism which has swept over the land, it has become fashionable to flatter the agricultural and laboring classes, because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot boxes; while a systematic effort has been made to decry the merchant and the banker, and to stigmatise their business as inimical to the liberty and prosperity of the country. We might pass over these *incendiary* doctrines with the *contempt* they deserve, if it were not for the widespread mischief which they work, by deluding, to their own injury, the numerous classes whom they are intended to cajole and flatter. The laborer and mechanic are taught to dislike the *banker*, whose means furnish them with daily employment; the farmer's mind is diligently imbued with a deadly hatred for the merchant and the banker, without whose assistance his CROPS WOULD ROT UPON THE FIELD.

It appears by the census of 1840, that the number of persons in Ohio, engaged in commerce, in agriculture, and in mechanical labors and trades, was as follows:

In Agriculture, - - - - -	272,579
Manufactures, Mechanics and Trades,	66,265
In Commerce, - - - - -	9,201

By this shewing, it appears, that the disparity between these classes is *very great*, that the *oppression* attempted to be practised by the many over the few, is at least *safe* to the agents employed in the experiment, and that however abject and unjust, however repugnant to the constitutional *principles of equality* and democracy such appeals to the prejudices of the mass may be, the demagogues who use them, do so in the confidence of an impunity guarantied by an odds of more than thirty to one in their favor.

The prosperity of the country, its peace, its character, and its credit, are deeply affected by the too successful influence of these

wretched intrigues. Even the bench has not been free from these pernicious opinions, and demagogues have been found so hardened and so daring, as to carry into that sacred tribunal the profligate pledge of party obedience, and to consummate there the atrocious proscription of individuals and classes.

Commerce, which is the agent that distributes blessings so universal and indispensable, is by no means obvious to the casual observer; though its advantages are pre-eminent, and widely diffused, the number engaged in this profession is so small in comparison with the aggregate of society, and their transactions, especially those of the greatest magnitude, attract so little attention, that the observation of the public is not awakened to a just appreciation of the mercantile character."

What a pity it is, and how unjust that this "princely," pre-eminent, dignified, useful and indispensable class, without whose assistance no one could live; who control all the wealth of the world, who "employ more industry, more capital, and more intellect, than all other employments and professions put together"!! who style themselves princes, owners of the mighty navies that circumnavigate the globe; are the arbiters of war and peace every where; in short, the only "business men" in the world; should have remained so long in obscurity; its pre-eminence, dignity and usefulness, not properly acknowledged by the public! What a shame!!

The best thing these sole "business men" can do, to bring themselves into notice, "attract more attention," so that the observation of the public may be awakened to a just appreciation of the pre-eminence, dignity, usefulness, and importance of their profession, will be to publish and widely disseminate such sentiments as are contained in the address just quoted from; especially among those ignorant wretches, the farmers, mechanics and laborers, who are cajoled, flattered and deluded to their own injury; and blindly and foolishly outnumber their betters at the ballot boxes.

That nine thousand merchants, bankers and brokers, should claim for themselves (notwithstanding they control the wealth of the country) more dignity, importance and consideration among their fellow-citizens, and more influence at the ballot-box, than three hundred and thirty thousand farmers and mechanics (who produce and bring into existence all the wealth of the State, by their own physi-

cal energies at the expense of much labor and toil) merely because they, the "business men," nominally distribute that wealth which the others have positively produced; seems to us most profoundly ridiculous. There is a passage in the Judge's address, which is completely shrouded in mystery, where he complains of the oppression attempted to be practised by the *many* over the few, of the violation of the constitutional principles of equality and democracy; the safety and impunity of the agents employed in making the attempt, because they are guarantied by an odds of thirty to one in their favor. What can he mean? Has any attempt ever been made to deprive "the business men of community" of their equal right to the ballot-box, with the rest of their fellow-citizens? We know of none. Now, as the Judge has failed to tell us what he means, precisely, as he ought to have done, we shall endeavor to supply the deficiency by venturing to guess.

It was shown, at chapter fourth of this work, that the capitalist, by the investment of five thousand dollars at six per cent., has the power virtually to own and control another man, "*which, in our peculiar phraseology, we term*" virtually *a slave*.

The capitalist of twenty thousand, four slaves; and so on in proportion.

Perhaps the Judge thinks, and may possibly think honestly, (but he must not forget that others have a right to think as well as he) that in accordance with the "democratic principles of equal rights," these slaves, like the negroes of the South, should be kept fron the ballot-box, and the masters vote in their stead, as the Southern slaveholders do: say one vote for each five thousand dollars, or for each slave, no matter which. If this be not his meaning, we are utterly at fault—we can imagine no other. If it is the proper meaning, why do not these gentlemen come up and make the avowal, honestly like men; unclouded by dark and incomprehensible insinuations?

If we are right in this conjecture, and such in reality be their claims, they may rest assured that the farmers and mechanics who create all that wealth, (upon the mere buying and selling of which, "the business men of community" arrogate to themselves such "transcendent dignity and usefulness") will never accede to them, so long as the declaration, "God has made all the nations of the

earth of one blood," stands in holy writ; so long as that self-evident truth, "all men are born free and equal," remains inscribed on the tablets of our hearts. Never—nor

> "While the earth bears a plant,
> Or the sea rolls its waves;"

Nor while there is an arm to bear arms, will American freemen grant such claims, nor be disfranchised for the lack of property—never!

The Judge tells us, the merchants are princes; and if he considered there was any probability of carrying out his scheme at the ballot-box, he might have consoled himself with the reflection, that it would not be long before these princes would be full grown kings, when that oppression of the *many* over the *few*, of which he so bitterly complains, and of the injustice of being outnumbered at the ballot-box, might soon be made short work of, and a speedy end put to that safety, which he says is now enjoyed with impunity by those that outnumber them. These self-styled "princes" ought to be well watched, and their growth particularly attended to, lest they rise up in majesty and power, and reduce us and our little ones to everlasting bondage. We may, perhaps, be charged with "daring" insolence, impertinence and presumption, &c. To this charge we will not demur; but humbly beg to be excused, on the ground that we have but followed in the footsteps of our illustrious princely predecessors, "which, in our peculiar phraseology, we term the pre-eminent, intellectual, indispensable business men of community."

> "*For gold*, his sword the hireling ruffian draws,
> *For gold the hireling judge distorts the laws;*
> Wealth, heap'd on wealth, nor truth, nor safety buys,
> The dangers gather as the treasures rise.
> But scarce observed, *the knowing and the bold*,
> Fall in the gen'ral massacre of gold;
> Wide wasting pest! that rages unconfin'd,
> And crowds with crimes the records of mankind.
> Unnumber'd suppliants crowd preferment's gate,
> Athirst for wealth, and burning to be great;
> Delusive fortune hears the incessant call,
> They mount, they shine,—evaporate and fall."
>
> DR. JOHNSON.

CHAPTER VII.

NATURE OF CAPITAL, MONEY, &C.

Capital, in a general sense, is that amount of the products of labor, of any and every kind, which remains over and above consumption during the time of production; in other words, surplus labor; and for reasons already given in the last chapter, the elements of nature can make no part of the *commercial* or *exchangeable value* of them.

In the farmer's case, it is that portion of the produce of his farm, which remains in his possession, say at the end of the year, after maintaining himself and family, paying his expenses, &c. This portion of his wealth may with propriety be called capital, surplus labor in its most simple forms. Suppose he should find himself possessed of a larger quantity of apples than he could possibly dispose of at the time; he well knows that if he keeps them a great length of time, a great portion of them will spoil on his hands; perhaps the whole, and become a dead loss upon his hands. To prevent which, he cuts and dries them, and by this operation his capital becomes more valuable than it was before. First, because a greater quantity of labor is condensed into about one-sixth of its former bulk, and about one-tenth of its former weight. Second, in its new form it has acquired another valuable property by the additional labor put upon it, and that is, it will keep much longer than before without danger of spoiling, by which the farmer will be enabled to dispose of it at the most favorable opportunity. By this condensation the following advantages are obtained. The cost, or labor of carriage or distribution to consumers at a distance from the farmer, will be diminished in proportion to the condensation; they will get the commodity so much cheaper. The farmer is also enabled to dispose of a greater quantity of his own labor in exchange for other commodities for his own use; which, but for the condensation, he could not have enjoyed. Hence we perceive, that the operation is beneficial to all parties concerned.

We will now suppose the farmer wishes to condense or concentrate this dried capital to a still greater degree, how will he effect it? Merely by exchanging it for an equivalent amount of gold or silver, in the form of coin or money, which is the most condensible, concentrative and convenient form yet discovered, into which capital or wealth can be converted. These metals having properties or qualities which no other substances possess, the principal of which are—first, being indestructible by fire; second, capability of keeping any length of time without suffering diminution in quantity; third, capability of being divided and sub-divided into the smallest portions without loss; fourth, being found in but a few places, and in limited quantities, make a natural limit to the quantity that can be produced, which is not the case with any other product of labor: demand being the limit of all other productions. These four qualities constitute the inherent, intrinsic, or natural value of these metals. Nothing can be more absurd or ridiculous than the common prevalent idea, that the value of gold and silver is in any degree whatever, conventional; because, no despot or government, no matter how potent, by any act whatever, can impart or diminish one iota of those qualities; and yet those properties, inherent in gold and silver, are what make them so universally sought after. This is so true and so simple, that nothing more need be said on this part of the subject. Another self-evident truth in regard to this matter is, that the natural or intrinsic value of any thing, can in no way be estimated by any amount of labor whatever; for the simple reason, that no amount of human labor or ingenuity whatever, can impart to any substance those inherent properties or qualities in the smallest degree; much less create them. God's works, or the elements of nature, can never be correlative, or in any way measurable, or can be estimated by man's works or labors, for the simple reason that he cannot do them. Therefore, they should never be confounded together; by doing so, the world has been filled with sin, fraud, violence, injustice, ignorance, crime and misery; and has given rise to those "paradoxical and unnatural institutions" by which the *civilized* world is now governed. The existence of the inherent properties in gold and silver, is the reason why they have been made use of as a universal medium of exchange, and by which

all *other* products of labor have been valued or compared with.

Now the *exchangeable or commercial* value of gold and silver is a different thing altogether from the intrinsic or natural, as much so as difference can be between any two things in existence. This value depends upon the quantity of labor and expense required to disembowel the metals from the earth, refine and put them into a useable or exchangeable form. This quantity of labor and expense, therefore, constitutes its cost or commercial value as will be shown by Mr. Weyland's train of reasoning. No man would be so foolish as to spend his time and labor in digging gold and silver from the earth for the purpose of making either food or clothing out of them, but it is necessary that he should have a supply of both; he, however, knows that the food and clothing makers will give him the products of their labor in exchange for his gold and silver. We shall use Mr. Weyland's argument, substituting in place of the hunter and fisherman, the miner and farmer:

"No one would be willing to exchange what has *cost* him two days labor, for that which has *cost* another man but one day's labor; because, rather than submit to the injustice of making such an exchange, he would create the exchangeable value himself."

(Man can create no other kind of value:)

"Thus, if two bushels of wheat could be produced by one day's or twelve hours labor, and if two ounces of silver could be procured and made in a proper form for use, the persons engaged in these pursuits, would exchange labor for labor, day for day, or hour for hour; that is, *one ounce of silver for one bushel of wheat.*"

The cost of each being equal.

Will any man presume to say, this transaction is not just and equitable? This simple principle might and ought to be applied to all transactions common between man and man—there can be no justice among men without it.

"*Cost,*" (Mr. Weyland tells us, and that truly,) "*forms the standard by which the degree of commercial or exchangeable value for long periods of time* (we suppose he means the average) *is to be estimated.*"

"Temporary circumstances may create a variation from this standard, and may for a short time elevate this value above, or depress it below the *cost*. These, however, can continue to operate but for a short time, as the natural tendency of exchangeable value is *always to gravitate towards the cost*."

And this it will do by the immutable law of supply and demand; which law is as immutable as the laws which govern and regulate the universe, and would work justice too, if not interfered with by royal usurpations, and unjust legislative enactments. It has been proven that gold and silver cannot derive any portion of its intrinsic or natural value by or from governmental enactments. So is it likewise impossible for government to impart any portion of the commercial or exchangable value, (which we shall hereafter call PASSABLE VALUE,) for the plain and simple reason, that no government ever did, or ever will, perform the labor necessary to impart that value. They have often attempted to establish the passable value of the precious metals, but have always failed: the immutable law of supply and demand frustrating all their visionary calculations and fine spun theories. And the reason is plain and simple—Mr. Weyland gives it: because, says he,

"The natural tendency of exchangable or passable value is, *to gravitate toward the cost of production*."

The reason of this is also plain and easily understood. It is, because, when any article of commerce will not exchange for the *cost of production*, the maker refrains from or quits producing it; on the other hand, when the price is above the cost of production, an unusual number of persons rush into that peculiar business, when competition soon restores the article to the *cost of production*. Thus every individual who endeavors to get before his fellows, is met by competition, which gives him a salutary check, and sends him back to wait for those he was outrunning, and himself accumulating his undue portion of wealth. The foregoing remarks are applicable to all the products of labor, not excluding the precious metals, whether in the form of coin or not; because, the operation of coining accomplishes nothing more than to manufacture them into definite portions or pieces of KNOWN WEIGHT AND FINE-

NESS; and this is all that government can do: it can no more put passable value on money, nor any other value, than it can disarrange the universe. Mr. Weyland must have known this truth; it is not possible he could have been ignorant of the fact. But why did he not tell us? The reason is plain; had he done so, he would not have served the interest of the grasping capitalist. He therefore shrouded the subject in mystery; he must be true to his class, the mass must be kept in ignorance, and doomed to everlasting poverty, for the purpose (as Mr. Colquhoun says) of affording to a favored few, *all the "riches, refinement, comfort and enjoyment."* The Rev. Mr. Blake, author of Political Economy for the use of American Schools, thinks it would be very improper to teach the poor the nature of political economy. But Mr. Blake has not the candor to tell us why. This he leaves for his friend Mr Colquhoun to do, who is more candid.

The value of the precious metals is not in the least degree increased by the process of coining, because the whole expense is paid out of the public revenue of the general government; so that, whether they be in the form of coin, or in bullion, or any form whatever, any certain weight of the same fineness, will always bear the same passable value.* All experience and observation prove this: it cannot be denied.

We will again take up Mr. Weyland's argument, and pursue the subject. Suppose that, by some cause, the supply of silver became more abundant than formerly, so that a man could procure by one day's labor four ounces of silver instead of two, the farmer would be unwilling to exchange as before; he would rather dig it from the earth himself. He (the farmer) would now demand two ounces of silver for one bushel of wheat, which would be the equivalents of labor; or, in other words, the passable value, or price of silver, would fall, so that the same amount of silver could not procure as much wheat as it could before. But, as in consequence of this reduction in price, there would be an increased demand for silver, that is, more persons would want it, because cheaper; and they would also want a larger quantity than before—being enabled to procure it by giving in exchange a less amount

* That is, if produced by the same amount of labor.

of their own labor. The silver miner would not be obliged at first to exchange at half the former rate, but would be able to exchange at a rate somewhat above it; say, perhaps, one and a half, or one and three-fourths ounces for the bushel of wheat. Thus we see, both parties would be gainers: the miner would procure more wheat, and the farmer more silver, by the same amount of labor. Thus a benefit to one is a benefit to all.

And thus we see that (other things being equal) the *greater* the supply of any article of commerce, not excluding money, the *less* is the passable value: and the *less* the supply, the *greater* is the exchangable or passable value. By this, it will be seen, also, that the greater abundance of the products of labor, produced in a given time, the cheaper they become; and the cheaper they are, the less labor will it require for every individual to supply his wants. High prices indicate scarcity; low prices, abundance. If a community desire, nominally, to raise the price of the products of labor, or to make an artificial scarcity, the best plan is to put in circulation money that represents more labor than it costs to make it. The advantage to be gained by this operation will be, those that make the fictitious money, (who will be a select few, of course,) will get in exchange from the many, THE FRUITS OF THEIR HARD LABOR. Working men ought to examine this subject critically, so as to understand it perfectly; and if they find it will be to their advantage, they ought to promote the operation; but, if not, it is their duty to put it down.

It may be laid down as an axiom, that the aggregate of money in circulation, measures the value of all other property; if a portion of that circulation consists of fictitious money, all the products of labor will obtain a proportionate fictitious value. It follows, therefore, that to increase or decrease the aggregate of the circulating medium, by any other means than by the introduction of that money, which is the work of labor, in proportion to the amount of the money, is but to make men dishonest by law; because the effect of it is the same as if all the weights and measures in the country had been altered. By the increase, all creditors are injured, and by the decrease or contraction, all debtors are plundered: and no advantages accrue to any individual whatever, save and

except to those who make the fictitious money—the select few.

It may also be laid down as an axiom, that gold and silver is as much bought and sold by other things, as other things are bought and sold by gold and silver.

We think it must be evident now, to all who have carefully read the foregoing remarks, that gold and silver, whether in the form of coin or not, are articles of commerce, or products of labor, and subject to all the laws of trade, to the immutable law of supply and demand, like all other commodities: differing only in one particular from them, which shall now be mentioned. The limit of production, as respects all commodities, other than gold and silver, is the full supply of the demand. When demand ceases, so also will production; therefore, production will always be in proportion to the demand. Now, let the demand be ever so great, there is always abundant means to supply it. But this is not the case with gold and silver. Inasmuch as there is no limit to the demand, it is necessary that the production should be limited by something else than demand. We have it, then, in *nature*. Gold and silver only being found in a few places and in limited quantities, but few persons can be employed in the production of them; therefore, it is impossible to produce them in unlimited quantities, as other commodities can be. And this is the grand reason why they have been used for a universal medium of exchange, and not because governments may have passed laws enacting that nothing else shall be made a legal tender in payment of debts. They (gold and silver) for the reasons above stated, cannot be suddenly expanded in the aggregate; neither can they be suddenly diminished or contracted; because, when once produced, they will last forever in comparison with other products of labor.

We often hear it asserted, that there is no real value in gold and silver, because we can neither eat them or drink them.

This seems a little plausible at first, but it is nothing but an argumentative clap-trap, intended only to bewilder the mind. We might with equal propriety say, there is no real value in bricks and stones, or in iron, because we can no more eat them, than we can gold and silver.

Wool is valuable for clothing, nothing answers the purpose better; mankind have pursued the same course in regard to all substances; they have adapted them to such purposes, as by experience they were found to be most suitable for. They have discovered by experience that gold and silver are better adapted to the purposes of a universal medium of exchange than any other substances; therefore, have been so used. The value of a determinate quantity is no more conventional than is a bushel of wheat, or a yard of cloth. All that is conventional is, the weight and fineness of the various coins, the solid contents of the bushel, and the determinate length of the yard stick. The exchangable value of all the products of labor, not excluding gold and silver, whether in the form of coin or not, depend, in the aggregate, upon the quantity of labor required to produce them, not upon law. The greater the distance between the place of production, and that of the consumption of any commodity, the higher will be its price; because the cost of transportation becomes a part of the cost of production. There is really no mystery about the nature of money; every man can understand it, if he will; those who are ignorant of it are liable to hourly imposition.

We think we have proved conclusively, that capital is nothing more than that portion of the products of labor which remains on hand, after the expiration of a given time employed in production.

That, in order to preserve some kinds of capital till wanted for consumption, it is necessary to condense and give it new properties, by employing an additional amount of labor upon it.

That the precious metals, in any form, is the most concentrative and most lasting form that human labor can be converted into.

And that, if all the products of labor of every kind were left free to competition, without confounding the natura value of the elements of nature with human labor, all exchangable commodities, will always gravitate towards the *cost* of production by the influence of the immutable law of *supply* and *demand;* consequently, the cheaper all commodities are, the greater is the quantity the producer is enabled to secure in return for his own labor. The working man ought to understand this subject above all others; his

hopes and happiness, and the welfare of his offspring, depends upon his havng a knowledge of it. It is his ignorance of it that enables the capitalist to cheat and gull him out of the fruits of his hard labor and toil.

There's a good time coming, boys; wait a little longer; justice will not sleep forever.

> "The wise will always govern their own fate,
> And fortune with officious zeal attends
> To crown their enterprizes with success."—PRINCE.

To shew that we are not alone in our views in regard to the precious metals, we subjoin the following:

Condy Raguet, in his work on Money and Banking, published at Philadelphia, in 1840, after taking notice of the fact, that, at several different periods, the relative value between gold and silver has varied considerably, notwithstanding their establishment by law. At page 10, he writes thus:

"The author believes he was one of the first, if not the first writer in this country, to call the attention of the public to this new change, and apprehensive at the time that the legislative folly of attempting to establish by law, what nature herself could not establish, would be repeated by a new enactment, he urged in December, 1821, the expediency" (he should have said justice) "of abolishing the coinage of eagles, and their fractional parts, and of substituting in their place new pieces, to weigh respectively *an ounce, a half, and a quarter of an ounce of standard gold*, under the full conviction that they would soon be introduced into circulation at their proper equivalent, without involving us in the absurdity of having two legal tenders." (Or two standards of value.)

CHAPTER VIII.

UNPRODUCTIVE AND ACTIVE CAPITAL.

Unproductive capital, Mr. Wayland thus enumerates: "Money lying in coffers, materials unsaleable, manufactures unoccupied, and *land lying waste.*" Now, we deny that land, either under cultivation, or lying waste, can be capital at all; for the simple reason, that *land is not a product of human labor;* therefore, not capital. The first three items, we admit, are unproductive capital; and we shall take occasion to add a few more, to wit: worn out clothing, ships laid up in dry dock, tenantless houses, negro-chattel slaves, dead or without employment, worn out machinery, &c.

Chattel slaves are a peculiar form of the slaveholder's capital, no one will deny. There are several objections to this form of capital; first, the positive expenditure of capital in some other form, perhaps in gold or silver, or perhaps a number of bales of cotton; second, the risks which attend this form of capital, by the slaves being subject to sickness and death; third, the responsibility of the master, in being obliged to furnish food and clothing to his slaves, whether they work or play; in fact, his own self-interest will prompt him to do it, in order to keep them in a healthy working condition; fourth, the obligation of the slaveholder, when his slaves are diseased or worn out by age and toil, to maintain and furnish them at least with some kind of a homestead. In view of the last two objections, it will be seen that capital in the form of slavery is not only unproductive, but is likewise consuming capital. Now, all that the slaveholder can accomplish is, to secure to his own use and proprietorship that portion of his slaves' labor, which remains after their maintenance—nothing more.

After all, it is but one of the various schemes invented, by which the many might be kept in poverty, so that a few (in the benevolent language of Mr. Colquhoun) might obtain all the riches, all the refinements, all the comforts,

all the enjoyments! And it is as just to obtain this end by one means as another. Who will say to the contrary?

PRODUCTIVE OR ACTIVE CAPITAL.

Political economists have much more to say on this part of the subject than any other; perhaps more than all the other parts united. But we utterly deny the possibility of the existence of any such thing!! because the activity and productiveness of which they palaver and prattle so much about, does not exist in the capital, *per se*, at all, but in the bone, sinew and life blood of human beings, the obedient living tools of the capitalist—those poverty-stricken beings, who have been stolen from their own land, or have had their land stolen from them, who are necessary to exist in society, for the purpose (as Mr. Colquhoun beautifully expresses, in the fulness of his benevolent heart,) *to furnish riches, refinements, comforts and enjoyments for their idle lordly masters—the favored few.*

All that capital can do in the premises is, after purchasing, or having found a human being in a state of poverty and dependence, made so by the injustice of society in depriving him of his birth-right in the soil, and other wrong doings, to supply a little fuel to set him to spinning out property for the sole use of his master, the capitalist, he (the capitalist) allowing only a sufficiency to keep up the requisite supply of fuel to keep him in action, as described in the 5th chapter of this work—which see.

By this improved system of *free slavery*, or free labor, as generally called, and is practised to perfection in our large factories, all those four objections above mentioned, are entirely obviated.

First. There is no expenditure made by the capitalist, to entitle him to the use of this property-making-man-machine; he finds his victim at once in his power, without the necessity of expending any capital in order to get possession of him.

Second. In the free slave system, the capitalist runs no risk in the sickness or death of his slave; he has no medicine to furnish, no doctor's bill to pay, no funeral expenses; in short, he has no interest at stake whatever; he can at any moment abandon his victim, and consign him to everlasting poverty and wretchedness, though he devoted the

best days of his life to the service of his master; he is cast aside with as much *sang froid*, and with about as much feeling, too, as if he were a worn out steam engine, or an old and useless grindstone. Such is the fate of the free laborer, and such the advantage of the free slave capitalist, over the chattel slave capitalist.

Third. The free labor capitalist is under no obligation to furnish food and raiment, when unable to furnish his slave with employment, nor a homestead either; neither will his interest prompt him to do it, but may turn him into the street without a home, or a place to lay his head, *to beg*, *to starve*, or to steal; neither does he suffer loss by the death of his victim, as the chattel slave capitalist does: he can find plenty more on the same cheap and easy terms.

Fourth. Under the free slave system, the capitalist is under no obligation to make provision for his old and worn out slave, upon whose labor and toil he has grown rich, and perhaps proud, save and except in the form of a poor-house; and if he presume to take advantage of this provision, Mr. Ware (a gentleman who has been mentioned in this work) says, he ought to be "killed off, that society might get rid of such excresences, and cast off such burdens." To take refuge in a poor-house, is held degrading by all classes of community, and is revolting to the feelings of one in whose heart yet lingers one spark of the fire of manhood; and to propose which, is an insult to any man of conscious integrity, and proper self-respect; the mere idea is too loathsome to be endured.

In England, where the poor house system has been carried out to the highest degree of perfection, history informs us, that the inmates discovered that the fare in the common jails was much superior to that of the poor-houses. The consequence was, the paupers preferred stealing, in order to become entitled to the privilege of entering a common jail, in preference to a poor house; because they were better used and better fed. When this was discovered by the patrons of charity and benevolence, it was decided that the usage in the jails should be more rigorous, and the common fare reduced, so that paupers might have a less motive to steal than to go to the poor houses. Such are the fruits of charity and benevolence. These facts will be found in "Lester's Condition and Fate of England."

We now propose a few questions for the serious consideration of those persons whose sympathies are so sensitive in regard to the injustice of negro slavery. First, would the condition of the negro be improved by giving him nominal freedom, yet withholding from him his right to the soil? Second, would any capitalist purchase slaves, if he possessed no more land than his own just portion; and every other man had his? Third, suppose the negroes emancipated, would they not emigrate to the free States, and come in direct competition with free laborers, and thereby reduce the wages of all, especially while the right to the soil was denied to all? Nothing could prevent such a result. Fourth, therefore, so long as the working man of the North is denied the freedom of the soil, just so long is it not his most vital interest to resist the progress of the emancipation of the slaves of the South? Working men, think seriously of this: do not be gulled.

Although the question of slavery has almost dissolved the Union, it has excited the bitterest sectional animosities; has thrown the whole country into commotion, all classes have entered the arena of contention; Christian churches have been set in hostile array, broken up and dissolved. And yet, after all, if we but carefully and dispassionately analyze the subject, we shall find that all the real elements that enter into the question, the very *prima mobile*, are nothing more than the jealousies and contentions of Northern and Southern capitalists—the Northern white slave driver and the Southern black slave driver. The Northern capitalist is jealous that his Southern fellow-citizen should be permitted to vote at the ballot-box, in lieu of his positive black slaves; while the latter is jealous that the former should be permitted "*to cajole and flatter*," or by compulsion, cause his nominal free laborers to vote in conjunction with him. The whole subject may be condensed in the following simple question.

Which is the best and most certain scheme, by which the wealth producers of all colors, may be plundered of the greatest amount of the products of labor in a given time? also, which plan will afford the most safety and security to the capitalist? This is the whole cream of the matter.

The American slavery and anti-slavery question, is about as important to the working classes of this country, as the

great division of British politics, "the landed interest and the moneyed interest," is to the operatives of Great Britain; which, in plain English, means this: which shall have the power best secured by law, to plunder the producers of wealth to the greatest extent: the LANDLORD OR THE MONEY LORD?

A very important matter, indeed, for the poor, plundered victims to contend about!! Equally so is the slavery question to the working classes of the United States. In this chapter we have shown that there is no such thing as active or productive capital, but in the form of chattel slavery. The pseudo free labor and chattel slavery systems have been compared—the advantages and disadvantages of both been considered. It now remains for the working man to decide which system is the best to suffer under, *or to be free.*

But, working men, would it not be better for us to let those gentlemen capitalists fight out their own battles? It is but a small business for us to meddle with. We have a higher and a juster, and a more righteous duty to perform; and that is, to cause man to have restored to him those natural and inalienable rights, of which unjust governments have cruelly deprived him.

Therefore, let us strike for the freedom of the public lands, and the inalienability of every man's homestead. Do this, and you pave the way for the attainment of such a state of freedom, happiness and security, as man has never yet enjoyed: neither rich nor poor.

CHAPTER IX.

DEBASING THE CIRCULATING MEDIUM.

It has been shewn, in chapter 6th, that money and all other commodities, which are the only just subjects of commerce, derive their passable or commercial value from the *quantity of labor required to produce them;* or, in other words, from the *cost of production.* The cost of production would be the *limit of price,* if the operations of mankind had not been interfered with by the usurpations of governments, but left to the perfect freedom of competition, and the immutable law of supply and demand: because, in this case, all the products of labor would always gravitate to *the cost of production.* But to prevent such a result, tyrannical Princes and sovereign States have brought to their aid, all the power that avarice, cupidity, fraud and injustice could suggest, or ingenuity contrive.

They have not hesitated to commit the most glaring outrages with perfect impunity; and had such acts as they have been guilty of been committed by a private individual, those same Princes would have cast him into a dungeon, or perhaps, have strangled him on a gallows, chopped off his head, or burned him at the stake.

The first instance we shall mention of the kind, is that of Charles XII., King of Sweden.

At a period of great difficulty, when much in want of funds, he borrowed a large amount of money from various persons, which he took to the royal mint, and had it reduced one half; that is, putting but half the former quantity of silver in each denomination of coin; at the same time making a law that the adulterated or diminished coin should be of the same exchangable value as before; therefore, a legal tender in payment of debts. He also made it criminal to pass or circulate the old coin, under severe pains and penalties; in other words, made it a crime to be honest. Now, the King not only acted the part of a robber himself, but made every debtor in his kingdom a robber also, and every creditor a victim to his

cruel injustice. The consequence was, that when the new coin got into circulation, this honest King was obliged to give his soldiers double the former pay, or they could not live, because all other commodities had risen to double the former price; because the value put upon the coin was but nominal, and was an attempt, by royal edict, to make it represent more labor than the cost of production; in other words, a check to competition: but the immutable law of supply and demand frustrated all his ingenious calculations. We admit that he succeeded in robbing the people of half the amount borrowed, but he had better have taken it by positive force, as the illegal robber does; then he would not have involved his innocent subjects in his own guilty practices: he would have stood *alone in his guilt.*

King Charles has not been alone in this worse than highway robbery; for Adam Smith tells us, that, originally, the English pound sterling was really one pound troy of silver of a determinate fineness, and that a shilling was one-twentieth of a ponnd, and a penny the one-twentieth of an ounce of silver, or one two hundred and fortieth part of a pound—hence the word penny weight. A crown, which is five shillings, or one-fourth of a pound, must have weighed three ounces. Further, Mr. Smith tells us, that the coins were used as standard weights, for the practical purpose of weighing such articles of commerce as was usual to sell by weight. But this system was too simple; too easily understood by the mass of the people. And here we take occasion to assert, that in order to establish an equitable system of commerce, all that is necessary to do, would be to make but one kind of metal (silver would be most convenient) the standard of value. Then make the denominations of coin correspond with the standard weights, by which all other commodities might be weighed, so that the money might be used for practical weights. But to perfect this system, it will be necessary to restore man to his natural right in the soil, and abolish all governmental checks to competition: also, all laws which recognize money, or rather labor value, in the elements of nature. If all this were done, we should like to be shown in what way or manner any man could become entitled to the products of labor, without himself performing the proper amount of labor, in order to obtain them, except by stealing, or robbing his fellows.

A system of commerce, not deviating very far from what has just been proposed, once, no doubt, existed; but it was too honest, too just, too simple, and too easily understood by the people, to accord with the rapacity and short-sighted selfishness of those cunning few who have heretofore controlled the destinies of mankind. Therefore it was abandoned for one better suited to their purposes,—one full of mystery, delusion and contradiction, and, as Mr. Paley calls it, "*unnatural and paradoxical.*" For what? Why, that a lordly few might monopolize all "the riches, all the refinement, all the comforts, and all the enjoyments,—a code of laws, which, Mr. Blackstone says, "it would be well if the mass of mankind would obey, *without scrutinizing too nicely into the reasons of making them.*" Mr. Smith pursues the subject further, and says:

"In every country of the world, I believe, the avarice and injustice of princes and sovereign States abusing the confidence of their subjects, have, by degrees, diminished the real quantity of metal which had been originally contained in their coins. The Roman As, in the latter ages of the republic, was reduced to the twenty-fourth part of its original value, [he should have said weight,] and, instead of weighing a pound, came to weigh only half an ounce!"

By the same swindling operation, the pound sterling of Great Britain (which once contained one pound troy,) has been reduced to about one-third of its original weight, a pound sterling weighing, at this time, but little over four ounces.

It must be evident to all who understand the foregoing remarks, that, at this hour, an ounce of silver will not purchase one iota more of the products of labor, than if those royal and lordly crimes had not been perpetrated; but the people were plundered, which was all they intended. Those royal swindlers, in order to reconcile the people to such acts of injustice, said they did so for the purpose of raising the value of money, and to prevent its being exported from the country. Now, this pretext was nothing more than an ingenious clap-trap, to gull the ignorant, as they well knew that the acts of which they were guilty could never accomplish either of those ends.

We suppose that it was at the time when one of those plundering operations was being perpetrated that Justice was

blindfolded, to prevent her from perceiving on which side her scales would preponderate. It may, perhaps, be well to explain the nature of, and the reason for, the alteration of the gold coin of the United States, in the year 1833, which we shall attempt to do in a very brief manner. Previous to the revolution in South America, the exchangable value between gold and silver was as one to fifteen, or one ounce of gold was equal to fifteen of silver. *After*, or during the Revolution, a much greater amount of silver than formerly was produced in the same amount of time, and circulated over the commercial world, while the production of gold remained about the same as usual. The consequence was, that the relative value between the two metals was disturbed, in the commercial world. Silver had become more abundant; people could obtain the same quantity by a less quantity of their own productions; in other words, *at less cost of labor:* therefore, would be willing to give proportionately more silver for an ounce of gold than formerly. Competition under the immutable law of supply and demand, had settled the exchangable value thus: one ounce of gold equal (in cost of production,) to sixteen ounces of silver.

Now, all that government did in the case, was, to adjust the gold coin so that *one ounce of gold coin should count as many dollars as sixteen ounces of silver.* It would not have been necessary to have done this, if the coins had been the standard weights of the country, as we shall show.

Suppose the dollar had contained one ounce of silver, and what is called the eagle had contained one ounce of gold, everybody would, at all times, be enabled to understand and detect most of the trickery and artifice of commerce. In the case just supposed, when the influx of silver had taken place, the weight of the coin would not have been altered, but people would merely have given sixteen dollars for one eagle, instead of fifteen, as they did before the influx. This thing is very simple, and easily understood, if we will but examine for ourselves. Simple as the act was, (just alluded to,) and necessary as it was for public convenience, yet the demagogues of the day took occasion to make it a rich source of political capital, by endeavoring to make the people believe, that, in its nature and consequences, it was similar to those acts of robbery so often committed by unjust monarchical despots and

venal legislators, though they well knew it to be otherwise, and as different as difference can be between any two things. But those demagogues had an object in view; the interests of capital must be served; a bone of contention must be thrown among the honest intentioned people, to engage their attention; while, at the same time, a combination of the capitalists of the country was effected, by means of which, *the circulating medium of the country was debased to a much greater extent than any despotic monarch ever yet dared to do;* but by a more cunningly devised operation.

The producers of wealth were "cajoled and flattered"; the prices of the farmer's productions were to be raised; likewise, the wages of the mechanic and laborer were to be doubled; and so they were; but it never occurred to those honest-hearted producers, that those high prices which they received, and for which they gave in exchange the fruits of their hard labor and toil, *cost the payers* (comparatively) *nothing*. Truly, the capitalist may well afford to give high prices and high wages, when the money with which he pays them *costs nothing to make!!*

The vocation of the king and the capitalist has always been the same,—namely, that of cheating or robbing the producers of wealth of the just reward for their labor and toil. This has been accomplished principally by two modes.

First. By monopolizing the land which was the free gift of God to all men, thereby making it a subject of bargain and sale; although Mr. Blackstone tells us, "*there is no foundation in nature or natural law, why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land.*"

Second. By making things represent more labor than it costs to produce them; by the means of arbitrary governmental checks to the operation of free competition.

We now ask,—First. What is the grand object of all those checks to competition? Answer. That the mass of the people may be kept in want, poverty and wretchedness, and a cunning, crafty few, secure to themselves "*all the riches, all the refinement, all the comfort, all the enjoyment.*"* Second. What kind of laws are necessary to produce such desirable ends? Answer. Those which are "very *paradoxical and unnatural.*"† Such a code, that it would be *unwise to let the poor understand or comprehend.*‡ A code

* Colquhoun. † Paley. ‡ Blake.

"which *the mass of mankind ought to obey, without inquiring too nicely into the reasons of making them.*" *

Now, fellow producers, such authority and testimony as We here give you, is of so respectable a character as to be irresistible, and is a collection of gems you should never forget.

We now lay down as an axiom, that any political measure which has for its object the building up of the capitalist, or is to enable him to give greater wages than he could or would do without it is proof sufficient that it is one of those paradoxical and unnatural checks to free competition, by which the producers are "cajoled and flattered" out of the just rewards for their labor. Because it is not so much the great quantity of wealth produced in a community that produces the most happiness and prosperity among the mass of people, as it is when there is the most equality in its distribution. Now, a special privilege of any kind granted to the rich, has a contrary effect: it creates a still greater disparity between the rich and the poor, than there was before. It is in perfect accordance with that old aristocratic maxim, "Government ought to take care of the rich, that they may be better able to take care of the poor." Yes, they will take care of the poor; and Mr. Colquhoun tells us how,—the mass, or the majority, must be made poor, so that a few may secure the fruits of the poor man's industry. Therefore, whenever the working man votes at the ballot box, his interest requires him to examine well the nature of all the measures he votes for, and take care he does not forge chains for himself to wear, or dig a pit for himself to fall in. Such things have been done, and may be done again. Never vote for special privileges for any parties whatever, as they are all violations of right, and arbitrary checks to free competition, which prevent the products of labor from *gravitating to the cost of production*, as they ought to do. Because, in proportion as the products of labor are left free to the operation of supply and demand, they become cheaper; consequently, every consumer obtains them in exchange for a less amount of his own time or labor.

Sometimes despotic princes, in order to gratify their avarice, cupidity and rapacity, have imposed a heavy tax or tariff on the mines producing the precious metals, instead of debasing the coin.

* Blackstone

After Mexico had been conquered by the Spaniards, history inform us, no less than one-half of the whole produce was exacted by the king, though it was much reduced subsequently. The "modus operandi" is somewhat different from that of debasing the coin; is more "secundum artem", a little more ingenious; not so easily understood by the mass; but not a whit more probono publico. The result is precisely the same,—the mass of the people are imposed upon, and the honest producer is cheated out of the fruits of his industry, so that *one man*, or a *few*, may live in idleness, pomp and splendor, while the mass are doomed to never-ceasing toil. In short, it is a scheme by which the products of labor are made *to cost the public more labor than is required to produce them*, and, in the case just mentioned, to double the amount. Now, this operation is nothing more nor less than a development of that far-famed, falsely-called principle of protection, by the mystification of which, "political demagogues (as Judge Hall says,) are enabled to cajole and flatter the agricultural and laboring classes, to their own injury, because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot box.

The party which is *protected*, in the above case of the mines, is the *king*. In the case of the British corn laws, it is the *land lord*. In the case of manufactures in any country, it is the *capitalist or money lord only*. But, in what manner the mass of the people are benefitted by a scheme which compels them to give more labor in exchange for things than is necessary to produce them, remains yet to be explained.

Humble and obscure as our position is in society, we do not hesitate to challenge and defy all the political economists in the world to disprove or refute the correctness of this explanation. Working men, it is your interest to look into this matter. Open your eyes, your ears, and your understandings.

If, in the place of Judge Hall, an honest feeling man; a good practical christian; one in whose heart there was no guile; who was willing to do unto others as he would that others should do unto him; that is, give an equal amount of his own labor in exchange for that of another man's; might be allowed to make a public speech, he might, with much appearance of truth, say something like what follows. After quoting some passages from "Judge Hall's

address," which may be found in the latter part of the sixth chapter of this work, then say:

Farmers, mechanics and laborers! you that create all the wealth of the world, not even excepting its capital, (for this, also, is but the work of your hands,) do you perceive with what contempt and indifference these self-styled princes, these devotees to the interests of capital, look upon you, and how they estimate your services? Do you see with what pomp, arrogance, and self-complacency, those "business men of community" put forth their own pre-eminence, dignity, usefulness, power and importance? Do you perceive how cunningly the honest merchant is coupled with the banker and broker? If you do, reflect.

When these disinterested gentlemen wish to obtain special privileges from government, for the benefit of the working classes especially, and for the public generally, (not themselves, by any means,) by which they can make all things (that are to be bought or sold,) represent more labor or money than it costs to produce them; when they want the power of drawing from the public, revenue from their own debts; when they propose to debase the circulating medium of the country, by mixing with it money which costs nothing to make; or, when they want the power of making things cost the public more money or labor than is required to produce them,—when these gentlemen are seeking the above named powers, what is their practice, the modus operandi?

The answer is best given, partly in the Judge's own words: "Under the influence of that fell spirit of demagogueism, which has swept over the land" like a blighting curse on the interests of industry, "it has become fashionable to flatter the "agricultural and laboring classes" with high prices for pork, for wheat, and hard labor, in promises to pay which cost nothing to make, "*because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot boxes*, while a systematic effort is made to trumpet forth the pre-eminent dignity and indispensable usefulness of banking, and of shaving the mass of the people of the fruits of their industry.

We are told that our very liberty, and the prosperity of the country depends alone upon the disinterested operations of the banker and broker. Millions of false money is scattered among the people. Great raree shows are got

up, and processions in pompous array, with flags, with banners, inscribed with all manner of cunning devices, bands of music, displays of eloquence; in short, everything that is calculated to captivate the ignorant and unthinking, is summoned to aid in this general commotion, and, in the midst of this wild delirium, are marshalled forth to the ballot boxes, for the purpose of building up the banker and broker. But, in the sequel of this mighty effort, the great monied monster is broken up, and its funds scattered to the winds; and the people find in their hands many millions, not of dollars, but of worthless, lying, broken promises "to pay." To command a proper degree of respect and veneration from the working classes, or, as the celebrated Hamilton would call them, "the swinish multitude," they are told of the mighty doings of those self-styled princes; "how they own all the mighty navies of the world; how they control all its wealth; that they are the arbiters of war and peace; that they employ more of the wealth, the industry, *and intellect of the American people, than all other employments united*"; in short, that they are almost the only useful class of people in the world.

When this course fails, they endeavor to excite our sympathy, by whining and complaining, that, notwithstanding "they employ the highest energies of the human intellect, and are seen in the most magnificent displays of wealth and power," yet "the observation of the public is not awakened to a just appreciation of their dignity and usefulness."

Moreover, they complain of the outrageous "oppression that is attempted to be practised by the Many over the Few"; "how abject and unjust, how repugnant to the constitutional principle of equality and democracy," it is, that three hundred and thirty thousand men, who create all the wealth of the State, should be permitted to outnumber *nine thousand self-styled princes of such pre-eminence, dignity and usefulness, at the ballot boxes!* What a shame!

"We might pass over these incendiary doctrines, with the contempt they deserve, if it were not for the widespread mischief which they work, by deluding, to their own injury, the numerous classes they are intended to *cajole and flatter*." "The laborer and mechanic are taught to" consider the banker and broker as their best friends, "whose means," they tell us, "furnish them with daily

employment, and that without their help the poor man could not even wag his jaw. "A diligent effort is made to" inspire the farmer's mind with sentiments of gratitude, and to secure his lasting friendship, by telling him, "that, but for the assistance of the banker and broker, his crops would rot upon the field." If the farmer does not believe or understand this logic, why, he is a stupid blockhead, and is blindly working contrary to his own interest. "The prosperity of the country, its peace, its character, and its credit, are deeply affected by the too successful influence of these wretched intrigues." "The masses are imbued with the opinion that wealth and poverty, speculation and industry, education and want of education, *do not* constitute hostile interests; and our legislative halls are disgraced by an abject subserviency" to the incessant clamor of the banker and broker for power and privilege, to such a degree, "that justice, patriotism, and manly freedom of thought, has been banished from that high sanctuary of sovereign power," where no other principle or practice but that of equal rights to all, special privileges to none, should ever have been recognized, nor a traitorous advocate been found to breathe or utter. "Even the bench has not been free from these pernicious opinions, and demagogues have been found so hardened and so daring, as to carry into that sacred tribunal the profligate pledge of obedience" to the interests of the banker and broker, "and there consummate the atrocious proscription" of those individuals who dare call in question the arrogant claims and silly pretensions of the banker and broker.

For the foregoing classical language and liberal ideas, we are entirely indebted to the Judge, to whom we acknowledge our unfeigned thanks.

A demagogue is one who endeavors to convince people they will be benefited by having their pockets well picked, or that the best method of promoting equal rights among a people, is to grant special privileges to a few.

CHAPTER X.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF WEALTH.

MANKIND in general appear to have become insane on the subject of production; they have never considered that it is as necessary to provide ways and means of consumption, as it is to multiply and accelerate the means of production, otherwise a state of over-production, as it is called, is produced, which is horrible in its consequences. As a remedy for such a state of things, the orthodox political economists have offered us but one alternative, and that is, the death of the laboring classes by starvation, misery and disease, till their numbers are reduced, while the surplus productions are being consumed, or, in other words, till a demand arises for labor. In proof of this, we shall quote from some of the orthodox economists. Blake says, page 89:

"If, besides furnishing subsistence for himself, the wages of the laborer would not enable him to maintain a wife, and bring up a family, the laboring classes would *gradually diminish*, [he does not, in this place, tell us by what means, but in another place he does; it is by *want*, emigration, disease, starvation and death,] and the scarcity of hands would then raise their wages, which would enable them to live with more comfort, and rear a family; but, as the capitalist will always keep wages as low as he can, [which is as near the starving point as possible; and to this point he can easily be brought, after being deprived of his natural right to the soil,] the laborer and his family can seldom command more than the necessaries of life," (that is, the smallest pittance requisite to keep soul and body together.)

We are told that the grand object of the capitalist should be, to cause the greatest amount of the products of labor to be produced in the least time possible, and at the least possible expense; also, the greater quantity he can secure for himself, the more he promotes the prosperity of his country. They seem to have forgotten the necessity of consumption.

Mr. Blake discourses thus

"Under free and secure governments, no man will suffer any part of his capital to lie idle; the demand for labor, therefore, is proportioned to the extent of capital. A growing capital is an increase of subsistence for the maintenance of the poor. Every increase of capital is the result of a *past*, and the cause of a future augmentation of the products of labor; therefore, whatever a man's property may be, he should be encouraged, by all means in his power, to improve it. It is of but little consequence to whom it belongs; because, wherever there is capital, the poor will never want employment."

This last assertion is not true, as all history and experience prove; for, nowhere in the world is capital more abundant, than in England, where it goes begging at two and a half per cent.; yet, nowhere in the world are the working classes in so destitute, wretched and starving condition. The conclusion that the reverend gentleman comes to, that it is of but little consequence to whom the wealth of a country belongs, is somewhat curious. Suppose it all belonged to, say, ten men, (or perhaps one would be better,) what think you would be the condition of the mass of the people? Would they be free, independent and happy? What a consoling reflection, to think that they had worn themselves out in toiling to heap up wealth for their masters, while they were not allowed to touch a bit of it, though perishing with starvation, and their masters wantonly wasting it, perhaps, in debauchery.

Let us suppose that the above mentioned author were obliged to change places with one of those down-trodden sons of labor and toil, after having made his master rich, by devoting to his service all the best energies of his life, should, in his old age, be turned out of doors, without a shilling in his pocket, perhaps with a wife and children who are as dear to him as his master's can be to him, without a home, or place to lay his head, with want and beggary staring him in the face. Think you not, this gentlemen would begin to consider that it was of some consequence to whom belonged the wealth that his own labor and toil had produced; whether to him who had done nothing towards its production, or to him that had created the whole of it? Would he not be very apt to come to a very different conclusion? We think he would

No wonder this same gentleman thought, when writing his book, that it would be very improper to let the poor understand the nature of Political Economy. There is nothing strange in that.

Malthus tells us, that "population always has a tendency to exceed the means of subsistence." Now, this is an absolute falsehood, where governments are anything like just, where the producers were allowed to possess the fruits of their own industry, where the land was not monopolized by a few, and competition left free to the operation of supply and demand. It is a well known fact, that any nation enjoying the advantages now known by the perfection of labor-saving machinery, and other aids to production, can produce from five to ten times as much wealth as would abundantly supply the wants of all, if it were but justly distributed, which should not be in proportion to a man's idleness, but in proportion to his industry. If this were done, such a thing as over production, to the injury of any one, could never take place; neither would it ever be necessary to kill off the surplus producers, nor condemn them to death by starvation. Neither would it be necessary to make poor-house provision for them, under which to consummate the measure of their degradation; because, in opposition to what Malthus says, the fact stares us in the face, that the power to produce wealth increases in a much greater ratio than the ability to consume it, and the greatest difficulty in the civilized world will be, how to dispose of the great surplus, so as to avert the usual alternative of killing off the producers, or suffering them to die of starvation. It is very evident that one of two things must be done. *The producers must be reinstated in their right in the soil, and become owners of labor-saving machinery, or wealth-consuming machinery must be put in operation.* Working men, it is for you to examine into this subject, and act accordingly.

We may, at least, console ourselves with the reflection that the time has gone by, when it was thought necessary that capitalists should learn such lessons, and quiet their consciences by such arguments, as political economists have written out for their benefit, specimens of which we shall now quote:—

"A man born in an already occupied world, if his family have not the means to support him, or if society have no need of his

labor, has no right to claim food; he is, in fact, superfluous on the earth and at the grand banquet of Nature there is no room for him." "Nature commands this man to be gone, and she will not be slow to put this order into execution herself."*

"When Malthus pronounced this extermination against the human race, Godwin thus replied: 'No; it is not the law of Nature; it is merely the law of a fictitious state of society, which heaps upon a few individuals enormous superabundance, and blindly lavishes upon them the means of indulging in all sorts of foolish expenses, in all the enjoyments of luxury and perversity, while the body of the human race is condemned to languish in want, or die of starvation.'"†

"Let every one in this world be answerable to himself, and for himself. So much the worse for those who are superfluous on this earth: we should have too much to do, if we were to give bread to those who were dying of hunger: who knows, even, that there would remain enough for the rich? population always having a tendency to exceed the means of subsistence. Charity is a folly, and an encouragement to idleness and want."‡

"When the demands for labor are numerous, the laborer's wages decline beneath the necessary rate at which they are able to maintain themselves in the same number, and the families most burdened by children and infirmities perish; then the offers of labor diminish, (by starvation,) then labor, being seldom offered, as a matter of course its remuneration rises, and the equilibrium is established."§

"If, besides furnishing subsistence for himself, the wages of the laborer would not enable him to maintain a wife, and bring up a family, the class [or breed] of laborers would gradually diminish, [by slow disease and starvation,] and the scarcity of hands would raise their wages, which would enable them to live with more comfort, and rear a family; but, as *the capitalist will always keep wages as low as he can*, the laborer and his family can seldom command more than the necessaries of life."‖

Sufficient specimens have been quoted from the works of various devotees to the interests of capital, to show that, be they English, French, or American, they all understand the game alike: their views are precisely the same. Justice, Religion and Morality must be sacrificed, and the rights of humanity violated, for the purpose of enabling a few capitalists to monopolize not only the land, but, also,

* Malthus. † Eugene Sue. ‡ Malthus. § Say. ‖ Blake.

all the wealth of the world; and when the producers have supplied their lordly masters with an overflowing abundance of all the comforts and luxuries of life, they must, in the midst of that plenty, created by their own labor alone, be condemned to want, lingering disease, starvation and death, by their cruel, unfeeling, and unjust lordly oppressors.

Such are their declarations to the world. It would be well if these gentlemen would tell the world upon what they found their right to do all this;—let us understand the why and the wherefore. Let them tell us, why should those who make nothing, get everything; while those who make everything, get nothing. Tell us *why*, men of learning. They may tell them, perhaps, it has always been the custom, and the *law* protects them in the practice; therefore, it is right; and, as the poor have not the power to resist the demands of the *capitalist*, *law*, therefore, makes it just. Will not this parity of reasoning justify the slaveholder? Most certainly it will, and the robber, also.

Let us now substitute a strong arm, or pistol, in the place of law, or heavy purse and robber, instead of capitalist, and try whether the argument would not suit the robber's case just as well. Let us suppose a scene.

A robber having deprived a traveler of his purse, the victim undertakes to expostulate with the robber on the justice of the practice, but is answered by the robber thus: You see, my friend, you ought not to complain: this has always been a custom, ever since the world began. Those who do not choose to work themselves, and to whom God has given sufficient talent and power, have always exacted their living from those He has left in a defenceless condition, and who are unable to resist the demands of their superiors. Now, you see, I have the talent and ingenuity to make a pistol, with the power, disposition and opportunity to use it. You He has left without talent and ingenuity, and in a defenceless condition; therefore, it is God's will that I should take care of myself. You have no reason to complain; because, when you get rich enough to buy a pistol, or cunning enough to make one, you can then do as I do now,—take care of yourself. True, the poor fellow might, by this string of sophistry, be dumbfounded and bewildered; but would he be satisfied that a great injustice had not been done him?

Now, here we ask, can the capitalist who strips the poor man of all the produce of his labor, except what is sufficient to keep life in him, justify himself by stronger and better arguments than may be brought forward in defence of the robber? If he can, they ought, in justice, be given to the world, so that all might know and understand upon what grounds a *few who make nothing* should enjoy all the wealth of the world, while those who create it should be doomed to poverty and starvation. Another question ought to be answered by the capitalist, before he gives judgment against us, which is,—*Who has a better right to a thing than he that makes it?* If A, who happens to be much stronger than B, withhold from him that wealth, or means of subsistence, to which B himself is entitled to, on the ground of his being the sole producer of it, till by degrees he is starved to death, is not A as positively the murderer of B, as if he had killed him in some other way? Can it make any difference, in a moral point of view, from what source A derives his power,—whether from his own inherent organization, or from the laws himself and associates have made, for the purpose of protecting themselves from a cowhide, a pistol, or a heavy well-filled purse?

Mr. Blake tells us, that "the rich and the poor are necessary to each other; because, without the rich, the poor would starve, and without the poor, the rich would be obliged to work."

Thus it appears, that, let the poor man look which way he will, starvation stares him in the face. For, if the capitalist do not employ him, he must starve; and if the capitalist does employ him, till he overburdens his master with wealth, then he must starve. So that his lot is an unenviable one, let him do the best he can. But is it not a strange conclusion the gentleman comes to, that if those that produce all the wealth of the world, were allowed to consume the fruits of their own industry, they would have to starve? This is incomprehensible to us, and requires an explanation. Now, as a remedy by which to avert the horrible consequences of over production, all that is necessary is, to let the producers consume what they produce: this they have a right to do, or they have no right to live. Restore to the landless his right to the soil: let the services of all men be left perfectly free to competition, governed alone by the immutable law of supply and demand. If this is

done, the poor will never starve to death for the want of employment, neither will it be necessary to invent machinery to consume the surplus wealth of the country.

We have one more observation to make n Mr. Blake's declaration. He says, "without the poor, the rich would be obliged to work." Oh, shocking! What a horrible calamity this would be, in comparison with the death of a much greater number of the poor, by want, misery and starvation! If every individual who is able, did but perform his share of the labor, necessary to supply all with an abundance of the comforts and luxuries of life, but a very small portion of time would be required to accomplish it.

Lord Brougham has, in a late work on the nature of labor-saving machinery, declared, that, after the most careful investigation of the subject, in England, with its present advantages in labor-saving machinery, &c., but twenty minutes' daily labor, by each individual, would be required, to furnish all with an abundance. Suppose it would require one, or even two hours' honest labor for each person, would that be too much for human nature to bear? We think it would do him good, keep him in health: he would be apt not to forget that he was but a man.

Is it not a strange and most astonishing conclusion that those humane, philosophical regulators of human affairs have arrived at, that the greatest good the rich can render the poor, is to strip them of the fruits of their industry, till they reduce them to a state of starvation? For such is the true state of the case, when stripped of its sophistry. Producers of wealth, this is for you to look into: examine the subject, and decide for yourselves. It is but common justice, that a man should be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his own industry, and it is downright robbery to deprive him of them. But it will be done, so long as the capitalist is permitted to monopolize the soil. This is the grand source from which he derives his power to dictate the terms upon which the poor man may draw his breath. Therefore, the first object of "National Reform" should be, to prevent the public lands being sold, for the purpose of speculation; but be given only in limited qantities to actual settlers. Producers of wealth, come up to the work of Reform, and contend manfully for your inalienable

rights; but quietly, peaceably and legally. You have but to decide, and the victory is gained.

The ballot box is in your hands. Never give up, but with your last dying breath, this *sacred right:* (not privilege.) It is your only hope.

CHAPTER XI.

WAGES OF LABOR.

Seize upon Truth, wherever found.
On christian or on heathen ground.
Among your friends, among your foes.
The plant 's divine, wher.'er it grows.
Cowper

Sometimes men tell more truth than is consistent with the grand object they have in view, in their attempts to enlighten the minds of their more ignorant fellow men Such appears to have been the case in regard to the particulars we are now going to mention.

Mr. Blake says, that "capital expended in the form of wages for labor, is a *small* amount of wealth [or labor] given in exchange for a *greater*." That is, they are of *unequal value.*

This is very candid in Mr. Blake, and is a truth so self-evident, that no one will attempt to deny it. The difference of value between the wages, or quantity of wealth given by the wages payer, and the quantity he gets in exchange for it, is sometimes very great; it is frequently two, three, four and five hundred per cent., and in many cases much greater. Suppose A, who is a mechanic, or wealth producer of any kind, can only earn one dollar per day, is necessitated or desires to have advice or instruction from B, who happens to know a little more than himself: say in law, physic, or anything else; in other words, has more talent, natural or acquired.

Now suppose B gives A the required advice or instruction, (which he does perhaps in the space of half an hour,) and for which service demands five dollars. Every body knows that such occurrences often take place. In this case, the disproportion is as one to one hundred and twenty: that is, B gets proportionately *one hundred and twenty days' labor* in exchange *for one* of his own. Now here, we ask, can there be any justice or equity in such an exchange? Can the man who exacts it be an honest man? Can he

be a Christian? Would he be willing to give one hundred and twenty dollars in exchange for one dollar? It is a bad rule that will not work both ways. The capitalist always takes profit, but never gives it. He will give one dollar for two or more, but will never give two for one, though he exacts it from others, deriving his power to enforce his demand from the fact that he holds in his hands the means by which the poor man can only live, his only alternative being either to take the capitalist's offer, or starve; in the words of the capitalist, give me three dollars in exchange for one, or die. Though, under the circumstances, the poor man consents to the proposition, yet it would be very difficult to convince him that a great injustice had not been done him.

After the king and the capitalist had monopolized the land and made it private property, it was found an easy operation to force from the landless man the fruits of his labor and toil, so as to prevent him from being able ever to accumulate capital for his own use. Consequently, the capitalist has always dictated the terms upon which he might exist upon the earth, giving his consent to the injustice only through the fear of death by starvation. This practice of injustice has existed from nobody knows when, and perpetuated from age to age down to the present moment; and the reason why, is merely because the king and capitalist have always made the laws, either directly or indirectly, by their influence; but they never could have consummated the atrocity, had they not, in the first place, seized upon the land, which is the natural inheritance of all men, and made it private property.

Mr. Weyland tells us, and that truly, "that no man would be willing to give two days of his own labor or service for that which cost another man but one day's labor," except when under the influence of some kind of constraint, or restraint, or, as Black has it, "*duress per minas*." On this subject the judgment of Blackstone is as follows, vol. 1, page 130:

"*Duress per minas*, is either for fear of loss of life, or else for fear of *mayhem*, or loss of limb. And this fear must be upon sufficient reason.

"Therefore, if a man, through fear of death or mayhem, is prevailed upon to execute a deed, or *do any other legal act;* these, though accompanied with all other the requisite solemnities, may

be afterwards avoided, if forced upon him by a well-grounded apprehension of losing his life, or even his limbs, in case of his non compliance. For whatever is done by a man, to save either life or member, is looked upon as done upon the highest *necessity and compulsion*."

In the case we have supposed, it is admitted that A accedes to B's proposition, but it is on the ground of choosing between two evils—he must consent, or fare worse; comply with B's demand, or die by starvation. To comply, under such circumstances, is, therefore, done "upon the highest *necessity and compulsion*." There is no other kind of compulsion than this, for no human power can make a man do an act which he *wills* not to do, because the *will* is the *cause* of *action*—the *motive gives impulse* to the *will*, and the prospect of good gives rise to the motive. The chattel slave obeys his master, and acts, though perhaps reluctantly, still in accordance with his own *will*, and in respect to animal action, whether human or not. There is no other kind of compulsion—this every anatomist well knows.

In view of the foregoing considerations, we ask, in all candor and honesty, in the name of justice and humanity, this question:

When one man exacts of another three dollars in exchange (or days' work, no matter which) for one of his own, on the ground that he had the opportunity and power to force a compliance, whether, in all its consequences to the suffering party and in its justice and morality, it is not precisely the same as if he should, when possessing power and opportunity, take forcibly from another two dollars and give nothing in exchange?

It is absolutely necessary that this question be satisfactorily answered: the good of society requires it. Working men ought to see to it. But, no matter how much a man might be disposed to act unjustly towards his fellow men, by demanding *much* wealth in exchange for but *little*, he never could have enforced this demand, if all men had stood on their natural and equal ground—the elements of nature had not been monopolized, nor the individual operations of mankind been interfered with, by unjust governmental enactments: free competition would have prevented it. The celebrated Mr. Blake, author of "Political Economy for the use of American Schools," says "That the wages of labor is a small amount of wealth given in ex-

change for a greater." Now this is true; nobody will deny it. Further, he tells us that the capitalist will always keep wages as low as he can, and make as much profit as he can; that is, take as much as he *can get*. This, also, we admit to be true: we have no wish to deny it. This same gentleman also tells us, that it is the duty of the capitalist to pursue this course to the utmost of his ability. For, says he, in proportion as he does this, he adds to the wealth of his country; thereby promoting its prosperity. But whether such a course of procedure is calculated to promote the happiness and well being of the toiling millions, or not, is a question yet to be decided by those who alone produce all the wealth of the world: to decide which, they will be fully qualified to do when they see the above doctrines stripped of their sophistry and false coloring, and shown up in all their naked deformity. This we shall now endeavor to do.

In the first place, we are told that it is the duty of the capitalist to take from the poor all the property that power, custom and opportunity will enable him to take. And the *more he takes*, and the less he gives, the better man he is; and the more he benefits his country.* In the next place, we are told, not only by Mr. Blake, but also by almost all other popular writers on the subject, that when this course is pursued and continued till the capitalist has accumulated more wealth than he knows what to do with, then those that have alone produced it, as a matter of course. must suffer in want, poverty, disease and misery; and, finally, perish by starvation: and to bring about this horrible result as soon as possible, is a duty the capitalist owes to his country! Such, then, are the lessons that have been taught the capitalist; and well has he profited by them. Those gentlemen have not been misrepresented—they have spoken themselves—the above doctrines are the sum and substance, the very cream of almost all the systems of Political Economy that have ever been written. Producers of wealth, how do you like the picture?

Shall we be told, in this land of equal rights, that the more property the rich take from the poor, by virtue of the strongest kind of compulsion, that of the fear of starvation, the more is the happiness of the people promoted?

* When the subservients of the interests of capital make use of the word "*country*," they mean the capitalists in it—nothing more.

Can the working classes be made to believe it? Is the happiness of the people promoted by starving them to death in the midst of plenty? O, shame! Shame, where is thy blush?

Is it any wonder that Mr. Blake was averse to having the poor taught the nature of such doctrines as he had written only for the edification of the capitalist? Truly, had he good reason to be ashamed of them. But his book was published for the use of American schools, where no other doctrines than equal rights should be taught. Now, did he calculate that, in American schools, poor men's children would never be allowed to enter, or, if they did, that they could be prevented from reading his book? Or did he think that the capitalist would learn his lesson so perfectly, that no poor man would ever be able to purchase one? Did it never occur to the gentleman, that a poor man, sometimes, not only knows how to read, but to reason also? Did it not occur to him, that the poor man would be very apt to reason thus? If it be a virtue, in those who have an abundance of good things, to take from others what they make, and leave them nothing, merely on the ground of having the will and the power, how much more virtuous would it be in those who have nothing, to take some of those good things (that were only being wasted by the rich) for their own use? especially, when they knew that those very good things were produced by their own labor, and for the want of which they were suffering, and for which they had received no equivalent? This would be but a fair and logical deduction, naturally drawn from Mr. Blake's own premises.

Is it any wonder that the world is full of crime and wickedness, strife and contention; and that men's rights have been violated, when such morality has been impressed upon the human mind, as Mr. Blake has put forth to the world? Are we to be told, that an act, which is done by the rich, is a virtue; but, if done by the poor, is a crime? And *that property does not rightfully belong to him who makes it, but to him who has the power and chooses to take it from him who does make it*? Now, with what degree of propriety can it be expected, that virtue could flourish under the teachings of such fearful lessons? As well might we expect to see the pine apple flourish in a bed of snow. But where did this gentleman learn these pernicious doctrines? Surely, not

from the Bible for there we read, "In the sweat of thy (own) face shalt thou eat thy bread until thou return unto the ground." There is no permission here given any man to eat his bread in the sweat of another man's face. Solomon says, "there is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink and enjoy the good of all his labor: it is the gift of God." Now we should like to know from where the capitalist derives his right to take away from any man this sacred gift of God? If they can show a reasonable title to it, why, then, they ought to have it. But if they cannot do this, their claims ought to be resisted to the utmost: it is injustice, oppression, tyranny, and cruelty; and to resist and destroy which, is "*obedience to God.*"

Is it not an insult to common sense, to tell us, that when the rich take property from the poor, it is a virtue, and a duty they owe their country; but if a poor man take property from the rich, then it is a crime—it is robbery? Are such men worthy of our respect? Are they the proper agents to teach the young American idea how to shoot? Surely, they are not; they are blind leaders of the blind, and such as are thus reproved by the prophet Isaiah:

"Wo unto them that call *evil good*, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; and put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. *Wo unto them which justify the wicked for a reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him. The Lord will enter into judgment with the teachers of his people, and the rulers thereof; for ye have eaten up the vineyards, and the spoil of the poor is in your houses.*"

Mr. Blake could not have learned his doctrines from the Gospel; for there, *all are required to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us.* Now, would this gentleman be willing that another, who happened to be stronger, or richer than himself, should take from him three dollars, and allow him but one in exchange? Would he be willing to suffer this wrong, and that, too, daily, during his life, and finally be starved to death? Would he submit to this? Certainly not, nor any other man, except under the influence of the strongest kind of compulsion. Yet, with all the coolness imaginable, he tells the rich it is a duty they owe their country to commit this very wrong to the utmost of their ability. Now, this gentleman being a preacher of the gospel, ought, instead of instructing the rich how to

wrong the poor—how to strip them of their industry, &c., to have given them the gospel doctrines.

"It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven." "As ye sow, so shall ye reap: they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind." "Go to, now, ye rich men, and weep and howl, for your miseries which shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth eaten. Your gold and silver are cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped, are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter. Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you. Behold, the judge standeth before the door."

And now the time has arrived when the arrogant claims of the capitalist must and will be resisted; but legally, quietly and peaceably. All the power the capitalist possesses of oppressing the poor, is derived from popular ignorance. Let but the public mind be enlightened on all subjects, and tyranny and oppression will cease in proportion. Therefore, look well to your common schools, as knowledge is power. Teach your children their rights, and, knowing them, how to maintain them: teach them, also, not to violate the rights of others; for if we do not respect the rights and feelings of others, how can we expect others to respect ours?

☞ "Perform fearlessly what you believe to be right. Never mind the opposition made by your enemies. They cannot harm you. The thrusts of those who hate or envy you will never hurt you, if you are faithful to your duty. Let truth, justice, and integrity, be on your side, and you may resist a host. With these, one may chase a thousand, and two can put ten thousand to flight."

Mansfield.

This is an exceeding good lesson, from which all may profit.

CHAPTER XII.

FUNDAMENTAL ERRORS OF GOVERNMENTS.

The fundamental errors of governments may be all classed under three heads.

The first grand error has been the establishment of the principle, that property rightly belongs not to him that makes it, but to him that has power to take it from him that does make it. From this error, springs almost all the wars and contentions between tribes, nations, kings and individuals. The robber justifies himself on the ground of the admission of this error, somewhat consistently too.

The second is in confirming the usurpations of kingly despots in seizing the elements of Nature; making them their own private property, and dictating the terms upon which the rest of mankind might enjoy them. This error is the grand lever by which the king and the capitalist are enabled to deprive the producers of wealth of the fruits of their industry; reduce them to beggary, starvation and death, just as it may suit their pleasure.

The third, is the right claimed by kings and governments of interfering with the products of labor, by causing them to represent more labor than it has cost to produce them; and by making them cost more labor than is required to produce them. From the prevalence of this error, arises the right of kings and governments to debase the currency of a country, either by the means of base metal, or paper money; thereby swindling the producers of wealth out of the fruits of their industry: also, all the cheating, swindling tricks of commerce, banking, shaving, &c.

In lieu of the above errors, we propose some fundamental curative truths; by the universal understanding of which, most of the moral and social evils, which at present afflict and destroy the peace of mankind, will be destroyed.

First. Let the producers of property be the rightful owners of what they produce; and, when given in exchange for other property, let it be for an equivalent; that is, of equal cost. This, we contend, every man has an unequi-

vocal right to, or a weak or poor man has no right to live. Has a man a right to his own limbs? Surely, no man will deny this. But we deny that he has any better right to his own limbs, than he has to whatever is produced by them. If any man has a right to take from another any portion of what he makes, what portion is it? If it is in proportion to his power, then it follows, as a matter of course, that if A be strong enough, or rich enough, he may take from B every thing he makes; and, finally, starve him to death. But this right we deny. The only just and rightful first owner to a piece of property, is he who makes it.

Second. Let all laws and customs be abolished which confound the natural or intrinsic value of the elements of nature with the products of man's labor. The custom of man in assuming exclusive ownership of the elements of nature, with the right to make another pay him for the use of them, is too glaring an absurdity to require a serious argument. What would you think of a man who should undertake to require other men to pay him daily a certain sum of money; say half as much as he could earn, or half a day's labor, because he enjoyed the sunshine, or because he breathed the atmosphere? Would you not think this a very strange requirement? Surely, you would. But, strange as it may appear, this very thing is effected, virtually, to an immense extent, in the form of *rent for the use of land*. There is just as much propriety and honesty in exacting pay for the use of either, because no man ever did or can make either; therefore, has no right to sell or exact pay for the use of either. All this, and much more tyranny and injustice arises from the error of confounding the value of the elements of nature with that of human labor. and has perplexed and bewildered almost all writers on Political Economy, and has rendered their works so unintelligible, so "unnatural and paradoxical."

For a more perfect understanding of this part of the subject, the reader is referred to Gray's lecture, who has done the subject ample justice.

Third. For a remedy for the third grand error, we propose that the gold and silver coins correspond with the standard weights of the country, by which all other commodities are weighed. The avoirdupois would, perhaps, be most convenient. Let the standard silver be about as at present, ten per cent. alloy, and the gold twenty-two

carets which should never be allowed to be altered; because, if they were, the effect would be the same as if the measures of length and capacity had been altered. Now suppose the dollar equal in weight to one ounce avoirdupois; sixteen dollars would weigh one pound, and fractional parts would be twenty pennyweights to the dollar, or twenty five-cent pieces—halves and quarters in proportion. Gold pieces should be of corresponding weight; then, as the relative exchangeable value is at this time as one to sixteen, it will follow, that one gold piece of an ounce weight, would be equal to sixteen dollars, or ounces of silver. No matter what the pieces be called, so they do but correctly indicate the weight and fineness, which was the original object in stamping coins—nothing more. Sufficient having been said on this point in the seventh chapter, we pass on.

If such a system were once established over the commercial world, it would break up all the money juggling of the world, because every body would understand the subject, and the producers of wealth would never submit to the impositions they now suffer in consequence of their present ignorance of the nature of it. There is, perhaps, no greater absurdity than the announcements we often see in the public papers in regard to the state of the "*money market*," in which "*specie*" is quoted at a "*premium*."

Now this is what really never can exist, for the plain and simple reason, that a thing can never be worth more than itself. Can a bushel of wheat ever be worth more than a bushel of wheat? No, never. But a bushel of wheat is, sometimes, worth more money than at others, but is never worth more wheat in the same place and at the same time. Neither can an ounce of silver be worth more than an ounce of silver, nor a dollar worth more than a dollar, must be self-evident to all. Such an announcement is nothing more than one of the gull-traps made use of by the banker and broker, in order to cover up the iniquity of their own unjust operations; for the real meaning is this: that the paper-money makers have debased or depreciated the whole amount of the circulating medium of the country to the ratio of the pretended premium. Such are some of the means made use of "to cajole and flatter the farmers, mechanics and laborers, because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot

boxes;" as Judge Hall says. It is one of the tricks of trade, by which things are made to represent more labor than it costs to make them.

If such a plan as here proposed, and as once existed, when men were honest, there never could exist a necessity for an alteration of it, neither would it ever be allowed by the people.

If an unusual influx of gold should happen to take place, by the discovery of it in larger quantities, or by the discovery of some process by which a given quantity could be produced at less cost, or in less time than formerly, it would, naturally, become cheaper; or, in other words, an ounce would sell for a less number of dollars, or ounces of silver. On the contrary, if gold should become more scarce, or cost more labor to produce the same quantity, than formerly, then it would, naturally, become dearer; or, in other words, an ounce would exchange for more dollars or ounces of silver. But in no case would it ever be necessary to alter the weight or fineness of the coins. One of the metals only should be made a legal tender in payment of debts; the other should only be considered an article of commerce. If this were the case, no difficulty would occur in case the relative commercial values of the two metals should happen to be disturbed. This is wherein our own laws are defective, because they make gold and silver both legal tenders in payment of debts; the consequence was, that the gold was rapidly leaving the country to find a better price in Europe, where they gave sixteen dollars an ounce; whereas, in this country, the law required only fifteen to be paid for it. No one, therefore, would be willing to take fifteen dollars for an article that he could get sixteen for. If the law, therefore, had made but one of the metals a legal tender, there would have been no necessity to have altered our gold coin as it was in 1834, especially, if the coins had been of equal weight. This subject has been explained in the ninth chapter; and if the reader's mind wants refreshing, he had better turn to it.

The copper coins do not enter into the aggregate value of the circulating medium, being only an article of convenience to represent the small fractions; their value being altogether nominal. The commercial value of copper is not over twenty-four cents per pound; but, in cents coined, there is forty to the pound, but are not a legal tender: if

they were made so, it would be necessary, to prevent impositions, to restrict the number in any single payment, as it is in England at present—say not over ninety-nine. That such a provision would be of much utility, must be evident to all; and would, in time, break up the money juggling of the world.

TABLE OF VALUES AND EQUIVALENTS.

Commodities.	Prices.		In Mills.	Equivalents in ounces.
Gold,	$16 00	per oz.	16,000	1
Silver,	1 00	do.	1,000	16
Tea,	75	lb.	750	340
Leather,	62½	lb.	625	409.6
Beeswax,	50	do.	500	512
Coffee,	37½	do.	375	682.6
Copper,	25	do.	250	1,024
Tin,	20	do.	200	1,280
Sugar,	12½	do.	125	2,040
Butter,	10	do.	100	2,560
Ham,	7	do.	70	3,666.6
Lard,	5	do.	50	5,120
Iron,	4	do.	40	6,400
Pork,	3	do.	30	8,533⅓
Flour,	2	do.	20	12,800
Hay,	½ cent	do.	5	51,200

It must be evident, from an inspection of the above table, that as the products of labor become more and more concentrated, they become more and more valuable: this arises principally from two causes. First, from the additional quantity of labor, for which the *producer* must be paid, or quit the business. Second, from the fact that they become more durable, less bulky, and can, therefore, be transported to a greater distance than before; for all which the distant *consumer* is willing to pay in all cases where the article wanted cannot be produced at home. And, with this kind of intercourse, governments ought never be allowed to interfere, as all interference of the kind are violations of individual rights. As the exchangable value of all commodities arises from the quantity of labor required to produce them, the last column shows that one ounce of gold is equal in value to 512 ounces of beeswax, or thirty-two pounds. The reason is, that it requires the same amount of labor to produce and bring to market 512 ounces of beeswax, as it will one ounce of gold: and so of all other commodities. When the mass of the people understand the truth of these principles, but one kind of weights will be used for weighing all things that are bought and sold by weight; the mysteries of commerce will be developed, and mankind, from the necessity of the case, will be obliged to return to the practice of justice and honesty. But legal property, or money value in the elements, must first be abolished.

CHAPTER XIII.

HUMAN RIGHTS.

THE following Declaration of Human Rights, was adopted by the National Reform Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, 1846; and it is in accordance with the principles contained therein, that this work is written, with a view to promote *Truth and Justice* among mankind.

Therefore, we most ardently hope that all honest seekers after truth, who are disposed to render justice to their fellow men, will give the document a careful, candid and unprejudiced consideration. To those who require of others what they are unwilling to grant themselves, we have nothing to say.

"DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

"We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, hereby declare and make known to the world—

That, whereas, all heretofore systems of governments, that have been established for the purpose of regulating the civil affairs of mankind, have been, and still are, most glaringly unjust, oppressive, cruel and tyrannical to a large portion of the human family, especially the working classes; by violating and depriving them of many of their dearest and most sacred rights. These statements we are ready to prove, by the most unequivocal evidence, to the satisfaction of all honest and candid minds disposed to render their fellow men justice.

From time immemorial, a self-constituted, select and powerful few have usurped the law-making power, and have imposed the fruits of their iniquity and unrighteous enactments upon a large majority of their more ignorant, weak and defenceless fellow men, without their will or consent.

They have deceived us by cunning sophisms, learned mysticisms, and the mere jingle of unmeaning words, totally disregarding the rights and feelings of their fellow men. They have given us error for truth, and truth for error. They have given us wrong for right, and right for wrong; evil for good, and good for evil. They have given us a code of laws which themselves admit to be contrary and in opposition to all natural right, and pronounce them "*para-*

doxical and unnatural institutions"—made them legal and binding on their fellow men; and, for the slightest breach thereof, have inflicted the most grievous pains and penalties.

They have invented false maxims in regard to the appropriation of the land; acted upon them as though they were based upon truth; at the same time Mr. Blackstone admits the whole to be a 'mere fiction.' This fraud, being committed, was legalized, made binding on society, was continued and perpetuated over the civilized world down to the present time; by which means, a large majority of mankind have been deprived of their natural and unalienable right to the free use of God's earth, (which He gave to no man in particular, but the free use to all mankind, in ages past, present, and to come,) except on the terms dictated by our self-made lords and masters. Besides which, we have been deprived of our right to enjoy the fruits of our own toil and industry, thereby reducing us to a state of dependence, poverty, slavery and destitution.

All these unjust, false principles, legal frauds and enactments, we unhesitatingly dissent from, abjure, repudiate and reject, from this time, henceforth and forever.

In lieu thereof, we propose, for the government of civil society, a simple code of laws, based upon natural and immutable justice, God's holy law of righteousness and equity—it being in perfect accordance with man's natural and unalienable rights; and by a full knowledge of which only, can society be regenerated and redeemed from its poverty, wretchedness, hypocrisy, infidelity, crime and misery; and, by its genial influence, render mankind virtuous and happy, and will be the certain means of accomplishing, practically, the benign precepts of the gospel.

The natural and unalienable rights of all men, without exception, are:

First. The right to personal security in an uninterrupted enjoyment of life and liberty—his limbs, his health and his reputation

Second. The right to own and possess, as bona-fide property, whatever may be made or produced by the energies or capabilities of the body and limbs of which he only is the rightful owner. And such property he has an indisputable right to keep, consume or destroy, at pleasure, to give or bequeath, to sell or exchange; and when he gives up any portion of it, for the use of others, he is, in justice, entitled to an equivalent, *but no more.*

Third. The right to the equal use of all the elements as they exist in a state of nature, to wit: air, sunshine, his due portion of land, and no more; water, fruits, vegetables, wild animals, fish, &c.: also, whatever exists in the bowels of the earth.

Fourth. The right to the full enjoyment of his religious opinions, and to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; being accountable to Him alone for the same.

These truths, one and all, we hold to be self-evident; and to violate any part of them, either by governments or individuals, is wrong, unjust and unrighteous, therefore our right to resist. And, for the truth of these principles, we appeal to the feelings of *all men*, and submit the following test. Let any individual, who may feel disposed to object to any of them, designate which right it is that he does not claim for himself, or is willing to renounce.

COROLLARIES.

1st. Any act which is, in its nature, *wrong*, never can be made *right* by the dictation of a despot, nor by the act of a legislative body.

2nd. All products of labor, or personal services, ought, in justice, to be exchanged on the basis of cost or equal amounts; taking advantage of the necessities of others, to obtain more, being robbery.

3rd. Slavery consists in being constrained to serve others to a greater extent than we are served in return.

4th. Governments do wrong when they confer upon, or grant a privilege or advantage to an individual which cannot in safety be granted to all.

5th. The only remuneration any individual has a right to demand of another, for the use of property, is wear and tear, or depreciation.

These five corollaries being naturally deduced from the Declaration of Rights, may be, therefore, laid down as axioms."

We shall, perhaps, be told that such principles, as here advocated, can never be reduced to practice. This we freely admit, so long as society is governed and controlled by our present "unnatural and paradoxical institutions," which prevent us from doing *right*, and impel us to do *wrong*. To remove *them*, is our object and aim—not to blame or censure individuals; for, whether we be *right doers* or *wrong doers*, we are equally the victims of their baneful and corrupting influence—a man daring not be honest if he would. All we ask for, is common justice, nothing more: if this cannot be had, is it not all nonsense to speak of religion and morality? Surely, it is.

But justice can and will be had. Let but these principles be disseminated and understood by the mass of mankind, and all the combined efforts of error, darkness and tyranny, cannot prevent the triumphant reign of Truth and Justice.

In conclusion of this chapter we shall quote some passages from the celebrated Blackstone, which are directly

to the point we wish to elucidate; and, than which, we think, nothing better can be written or said. He says vol. 1, page 124:

"The principal aim of society is to protect individuals in the enjoyment of those absolute rights which were vested in them by the immutable laws of nature, but which could not be preserved in peace without that mutual assistance and intercourse which is gained by the institution of friendly and social communities. Hence it follows, that the first and primary end of human laws, is to *maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals.*

Such rights as are social and relative, result from, and are posterior to the formation of states and societies; so that to maintain and regulate these, is clearly but a subsequent (or after) consideration. And, therefore, the principal view of human laws is, or *ought always to be, to explain, protect and enforce such rights as are absolute, which are, in themselves, few and simple.*" [And, we say, easily understood.]

"The absolute rights of man, considered as a free* agent," endowed with discernment to know good from evil, (or pleasure from pain,) and with power of choosing those measures which *appear* to him to be most desirable, (or will afford the greatest amount of happiness or pleasurable sensations,) are usually summed up in one general appellation, and denominated 'the natural liberty of mankind.' This natural liberty consists, properly, in a power of acting as one thinks fit, without any restraint or control, unless by the law of nature—being a *right inherent* in us by birth, and one of the gifts of God to man at his creation," [or whenever He brings him into existence.]

"Political or civil liberty, which is that of a member of society, is no other than natural liberty, so far restrained by human laws, and no farther, than is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public." [That is, than will promote the greatest amount of happiness.] Hence, we may collect, that the law which

* There is much misunderstanding in regard to the term, free agency. Man is only free to do good; he is never free to do himself an injury, or inflict on himself pain, as every one may *know* by appealing to his own feelings and experience. True, men do often injure themselves; but self-injury is never the object of a deliberate, or voluntary act, must be evident to all. When men do injure themselves, it is clearly attributable, either to habitual ignorance or a want of reflection in not looking to ultimate consequences. Besides, "free agent" is a solecism, or paradox; each member of the term annulling the other, like two negatives in the same sentence. Agent, being one who is required and bound to execute the will of another; therefore, can, in no sense, be free. If man be *but* an *agent*, he cannot be *free;* if he be *free* to act as he *wills, chooses, or pleases*, he cannot be an agent. This is clear. Therefore, the term "*free agent*," is an absurdity.

restrains a man from doing mischief to his fellow citizens, though it diminishes the natural, increases the civil liberty of mankind; but every wanton and causeless restraint of the will of the subject, whether practised by a monarch, a nobility, or a popular assembly, is a degree of tyranny." [And, to resist it, is obedience to God.]

Now, we should like to know, if anything can be written more radical than the foregoing sentiments of Mr. Blackstone? Again he says, page 40, vol. 1:

"As, therefore, the Creator is a being not only of infinite *power* and *wisdom*, but also of infinite *goodness*, He has been pleased so to contrive the constitution and frame of humanity, that we should want no other prompter to enquire after and pursue the rule of right, but our own *self-love*, that *universal principle of action*. For he has so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven *the laws of Eternal Justice* with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be obtained but by observing the former; and if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot but induce the latter. [That is, the happiness of mankind cannot be attained but by acting in accordance with the laws of Eternal Justice, as put forth in the 'declaration of human rights.' And if they are punctually obeyed, and human rights are not violated, it cannot fail to induce universal happiness among mankind.] In consequence of which mutual connection of justice and human felicity, He has not perplexed the law of nature with a multitude of abstracted rules and precepts, referring merely to the fitness or unfitness of [artificial] things, as some have vainly surmised; but has graciously reduced the rule of obedience to this one paternal precept, 'THAT MAN SHOULD PURSUE HIS OWN HAPPINESS.' This is the foundation of what we call ethics, or natural law. For the several articles into which it is branched in our systems, amount to no more than demonstrating that this or that action tends to man's real happiness, and, therefore, very justly concluding that the performance of it *is a part of the law of nature;* or, on the other hand, that this or that action is destructive to man's real happiness, and, therefore, that the law of nature forbids it. [Therefore a virtue in us to resist its operations.]

"This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is, of course, *superior in obligation to any other*. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times: *no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid, derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this Original.*

"But, in order to apply this to the particular exigencies of each individual, it is still necessary to have recourse to reason, whose

office it is to discover, by considering what method [or *moral action*] will tend the most effectually to [promote] our own substantial happiness. And if our reason were always clear and perfect, unruffled by passion, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by disease or intemperance, the task would be pleasant and easy—*we should need no other guide but this.* But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that *his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error.*"

So says Blackstone. Now the great question upon which our happiness and the peace of mankind depends, is, are these doctrines true? Surely, no one can doubt their truth, if he but lay aside his prejudices long enough to examine the subject, and appeal to his own unbiased judgment, his own natural feelings, his own observation and experience, especially when he takes into view his own relative connection with the rest of his species. Let him but do this, and he will find his task pleasant and easy, and cannot fail to come to right conclusions, if he is a sincere seeker after truth, and is disposed to be just to his fellow men. "Prove all things—hold fast that which is good."

If, then, these doctrines be true, why is it that so much crime and misery exist in the world, while the universal and ever continuous and most ardent desire of *all men* is to enjoy happiness? We ask, why is it? It is because a "paradoxical and unnatural" system of artificial law has been imposed upon us, by which our reason has been blinded and corrupted, and our understanding perverted by the ignorance and errors of those who have heretofore controlled our destiny. They have mistaken the right road to happiness themselves, by violating the divine law which governs our being; we have followed our blind guides, and, consequently, have all fallen into the ditch of misery together.

The fundamental error of our lordly ancestors has been this: that we promote our own happiness best by violating the rights of others, in monopolizing and making private property of the elements of nature, which were the free gift of God in common to all mankind, and by plundering others of the fruits of their industry. This, then, is the false notion that has corrupted our hearts and our reason, blinded our eyes, and prevented us from having a clear view of our own true interest, or the right road to happiness.

Let mankind but see clearly the way to promote and secure their own happiness, and it will be accomplished—nothing can prevent it;—

"For [as Blackstone says] God has so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former; and if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot fail to induce the latter. He has also graciously reduced the law of obedience to this one paternal precept, that *man should pursue his own happiness.*"

And this is the whole social and moral duty of man. This divine and immutable law, Mr. Blackstone says,

"Being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid, derive all their force and all their authority from this [divine] original."

It is in the violation of this great fundamental and immutable law of eternal justice, that we find a solution to that strange and monstrous anomaly which stares us in the face in all so called civilized countries where the population is dense:

"That the great evil which, in these modern times, most perplexes society and bewilders political economists, is OVER PRODUCTION! that, in consequence of the people producing too much, they therefore have too little! that the scarcity of consumers is owing to an excess of population! and that the power of the country to create unbounded wealth, is the cause of the unbounded destitution and wretchedness of its inhabitants."

Charles Rowcroft's Ned Lacy.

What a paradoxical and unnatural state of affairs it is! but it is truly described. The few have made shipwreck of their own happiness, and prevented the many from pursuing theirs, by violating the immutable law of eternal justice. But the evident truth is, we secure our own happiness best by promoting that of others. For if we do not respect the rights and feelings of others, with what degree of consistency can we expect others to respect ours? We

should be insane if we did. Therefore it is plain that our interest and duty is but one and the same thing. We shall lose nothing by making all men our friends; neither shall we gain anything by making one single man an enemy. And,

> "For modes of faith, let graceless bigots fight;
> His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."
>
> *Pope.*

> Seize upon truth, wherever found,
> On christian or on heathen ground;
> Among your friends, among your foes,—
> The plant 's divine, where'er it grows.
>
> *Cowper.*

The strongest evidence we can have of the truth of anything, is the evidence of our own senses. The next strongest is analogy; and the weakest, and least to be depended upon, is that of testimony, written or oral: but, remember, we are never convinced of the truth or falsehood of anything because we *will* or *choose:* it is the force of evidence, which convinces us of the truth of what is proposed, and if we disbelieve, it is because there is a lack of evidence. Therefore, we should not blame or censure others, because they do not believe as we do. We violate the great law if we do. We shall now quote another gem from Pope, to show that he and Blackstone perfectly coincided in regard to the doctrines just advanced.

> "Self-love, the spring of motion, acts the soul,
> Reason's comparing balance regulates the whole;
> Man, but for this, (self-love,) no action could attend,
> And, but for that, (reason,) were action to no end."

The above four lines constitute a volume on human nature, and is worthy of much serious consideration.

Now, if the foregoing doctrines be true, we are irresistibly drawn to the conclusion, that every person that does a wrong act, is, to that degree, insane; and it would seem that the idea is becoming prevalent, from the complexion of many of the decisions latterly given in our courts of justice in various parts of the country. If it be so, it is clear that, instead of pursuing the delinquent with vengeance, pains and penalties, it is the imperative duty of

those who wish to reform mankind, to endeavor to remove the temptations which cause them to err, and convince them of their errors.

Convince a man of his error, and he will do right without compulsion; if you cannot do this, vain and fruitless will be your endeavors to reform him. An ounce of prevention is worth ten thousand pounds of cure. But we should always be extremely careful, while we require others to do *right*, that we ourselves are not doing *wrong;* thereby teaching *wrong* much faster and stronger by example, than we teach *right* by mere precept.

This has been the great error of our original lawmakers: they have been the first and greatest aggressors and violators of right themselves; at the same time not only requiring others to be just, but also to submit quietly to their tyrannous impositions. And if an oppressed individual dared but attempt to do himself justice, or murmur a complaint, he must be strangled to death—have his head chopped off, or doomed to drag out a miserable existence within the walls of a flesh-consuming, solitary dungeon. And this, they have had the unblushing audacity to call *justice*. What "*paradoxical and unnatural institutions!*"

What a sad reflection it is to think of, that such a talented man, such a profound thinker as Blackstone was who could demonstrate and explain so perfectly, in such simple yet dignified language, the divine law of immutable justice, should forget himself, or disregard and entirely lay aside those fundamental principles he had set out with: that he should devote, perhaps, the best portion of his life to the task of surrounding with mystery and sophistry, in defence of a set of laws pretended to have for their object the good government of society, which, as a whole, he must have well known to be an outrageous violation of the great law of immutable justice, which, he tells us, is superior to all other laws; and, if contrary to it, are of no validity whatever. But so it is; the short-sighted selfishness of the king and the capitalist must be served, if he wrote at all, or else have lost his head.

We are now through with fundamental principles, and shall call the attention of the reader to the consideration of some special measures, which have been adopted in various countries, for the alleged purpose of inducing the

prosperity of the people, but which, we propose to show, have quite a contrary effect. They are as follows:

First. Permanent Funded Debts, whether of a national character, or otherwise.

Second. The Banking system.

Third. Tariffs, under the plea of Protection.

CHAPTER XIV.

PERMANENT FUNDED DEBTS.

We have been so long under the dominion of error—have become so familiar with it, and look upon it with such complacency, that the simple announcement of the truth startles us almost with affright. But the time has now arrived when it must be told; suffering humanity imperiously demands it. Let this be our apology.

Some political wiseacres have told us, that public debts are public blessings; but they have never explained the subject, nor told us why, nor who were the receivers of the blessings, and at whose cost and suffering these blessings were paid; or, rather, who they are forcibly filched from. There is, perhaps, among all the schemes invented for the purpose of enabling the few to live at the expense of the many, none better calculated to work this end than the establishment of permanently funded debts; because, every body knows that interest, at six per cent., in less than seventeen years, will equal the capital invested. Now, we should like to know by what rule of right, justice or equity, when the original sum borrowed has once been honestly paid, why it should be paid again, and that, too, many times over, and by those who never borrowed it, nor ever had the use of it? How can a man owe anything to another previous to his own birth? or, to another, from whom he has never received anything? Producers of wealth, it is for us to look into this matter.

The fact, that if only one dollar being invested permanently, and so continued long enough, would require all the money in the world to pay the interest, is proof that there is something fundamentally wrong in the principle. When we purchase a coat, a hat, or a pair of shoes, we pay for them but once; and if the seller should demand pay a second time, he would only be laughed at—every body at once perceiving the absurdity of the demand. Yet, if we purchase a large sum of money, or even only promises of money—(on time, as the money jugglers say)—

purchase a canal, a rail road, gas works, water works, or other public improvement, or purchase an expensive war, they are required to be paid for many times over, and the obligations transmitted to future generations; by which means, the members of society are born into the world in two distinct classes, possessing unequal rights at birth, namely, debtors and creditors, though no transactions have yet occurred between the parties. In other words, the greatest portion of mankind are born with saddles on their backs, and a lordly few, ready booted and spurred, to ride them.

We ask, now, is there any justice in such operations? Surely, there is not. But, producers of wealth, this is a question for you to decide; for it is you who are born with saddles on your backs, and you alone foot up and pay all these bills of expense. We do contend, that when a debt has been once paid back by the interest, that it is, and ought in justice to be, cancelled; for, whatever the debtor pays beyond this, he receives no equivalent for; neither is there any justice in forcing the payment of it.

There has been no scheme yet invented, by the money lords of the world, that consummates and brings to perfection, with more certainty, that perplexing paradox, observable in all civilized countries, (where the people suffer from over-production—where the scarcity of consumers is owing to an excess of population, and the power of a country to create unbounded wealth is the cause of the poverty and destitution of its inhabitants,) than the establishment of funded permanent debts. Nothing has a more certain tendency to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer; and if the practice is persisted in, a time must come when there will not be money enough in the world to pay the interest on the investments.

The public debt of Great Britain has been paid and repaid to the original creditors, or their successors, several times over: why, then, in the name of justice, should it be paid again? Let the producers of wealth answer, as they alone are the sufferers. In our view of the matter, the wisest, the most just and virtuous act the British government could do would be to wipe out at a stroke, as it were with a sponge, the whole stupendous pauper-making contrivance—"get rid of such excrescences—cast off such burdens"—abolish such blighting, withering curses. How

many hearts it would make glad, no tongue can tell. It would be worthy of a universal jubilee.

We shall, no doubt, be told that, to abolish such debts, would be gross injustice, inasmuch as it would reduce to want and beggary many widows and orphans. There is some weight, to be sure, in this argument; but it is transcendently outweighed by the consideration that a much greater number, not only of widows and orphans, but the great mass of the industrious classes are continually being reduced, not only to want and beggary, but also to pauperism, starvation and untimely death, by their continuance. Surely, such an objector must be one of those characters described in the gospel, with a beam in his own eye, looking for a mote in that of his brother's—can strain at a gnat, and yet swallow a camel, when the case requires it.

We shall now quote Thomas Jefferson (that firm, unflinching advocate of the people's rights) on the subject of funded debts. Vol. 4, page 196, in his letter to John W. Eppes, he says:

"It is wise, and should be fundamental, in a government disposed to cherish its credit and at the same time to restrain the use of it within the limits of its faculties, 'never to borrow a dollar without laying a tax in the same instant for paying the interest annually, and the principal within a given term; and to consider that tax as pledged to the creditors on the public faith. On such a pledge as this, sacredly observed, a government may always command, on a reasonable interest, all the lendable money of their citizens, while the necessity of an equivalent tax is a salutary warning to them and their constituents against oppressions, bankruptcy and, its inevitable consequence, revolution. But the term of redemption must be moderate, and, at any rate, within their rightful powers. But what limits, it will be asked, does this prescribe to their rightful powers? What is to hinder them from creating a perpetual debt? The laws of nature answer. *The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead. The will and power* of man expire with his life by nature's law. Some societies give it an artificial continuance, for the encouragement of industry;] or, rather, for the encouragement of speculation and injustice;] some refuse it, as our aboriginal neighbors, whom we call barbarians. The generations of men may be considered as bodies, or corporations. Each generation has the usufruct of the earth during the period of its continuance. When it ceases to exist, the usufruct passes on to the succeeding generation free and unincumbered, and so on suc-

cessively from one generation to another forever. We may consider each generation as a distinct nation, with a right, by the will of its majority, to bind themselves, but none to bind the succeeding generation, more than the inhabitants of another country.

"The period of a generation, or the term of its life, is determined by the laws of mortality, which, varying a little only in different climates, offer a general average, to be found by observation. I turn, for instance, to Buffon's tables, of 23,994 deaths, and the ages at which they happened, and I find, of the numbers of all ages living at one moment, half will be dead in twenty-four years and eight months. But (leaving out minors, who have not the power of self-government,) of the adults (of twenty-one years of age) living at one moment, a majority of whom act for society, one-half will be dead in eighteen years and eight months. At nineteen years, then, from the date of a contract, the majority of the contractors are dead, *and their contract with them.* Let this general theory be applied to a particular case. Suppose the annual births of the State of New York to be 23,994: the whole number of its inhabitants, according to Buffon, will be 617,703, of all ages. Of these, there would constantly be 269,286 minors and 348,417 adults; of which last, 174,290 will be a majority. Suppose that majority, on the first day of the year 1794, had borrowed a sum of money equal to the fee simple value of the State, and to have consumed it in eating, drinking, and making merry in their day; or, if you please, in quarreling and fighting with their unoffending neighbors. Within eighteen years and eight months, one-half of the adult citizens are dead. Till then, being the majority, they might rightfully levy the interest of their debts on themselves and their fellow revelers, or fellow champions. But, at that period, a new majority have come into place, in their own right, *and not under the rights, the conditions, or laws of their predecessors.* Are they bound to acknowledge the debt—to consider the preceding generation as having had a right to eat up the whole soil of their country in the course of a life—to alienate it from them; (for it would be an alienation to the creditors;) and would they think themselves either legally or morally bound to give up their country and emigrate to another for subsistence? Every one would say, no: *that the soil is the gift of God to the living, as much as it had been to the deceased generation; and that the laws of nature impose no obligation on them to* PAY THIS DEBT. And although, like some other natural rights, this has not yet entered into any declaration of rights, it is no less a law, *and ought to be acted on by honest governments.* It is, at the same time, a salutary curb on the spirit of war and indebtment, which, since the modern theory of the perpetuation of debt, has drenched the earth with blood, and crushed its inhabitants under burdens ever accumulating.

"Had this principle been declared in the British Bill of Rights, England would have been placed under the happy disability of waging eternal war, and of contracting her thousand millions of public debt. In seeking then for an ultimate term for the redemption of our debts, let us rally to this principle, and provide for their payment within the term of nineteen years at the farthest. Our government has not, as yet, begun to act on the rule of loans and taxation going hand in hand. Had any loan taken place in my time, I should have strongly urged a redeeming tax. For the loan which has been made since the last session of Congress, we should now set the example of appropriating some particular tax sufficient to pay the interest annually, and the principal within the fixed term, less than nineteen years. And I hope yourself and your committee will render the immortal service of introducing this practice."

So hoped Thomas Jefferson. But those honorable gentlemen never rendered their fellow-citizens that immortal service: it remains yet to be consummated, and is one of the great duties incumbent on the National Reformers. It cannot be expected that our legislators will abolish the present pernicious practice of funding debts, until driven into the measure by the people: then they must do it. Let us "cast off such burdens, get rid of such excrescences." According to Mr. Jefferson's principle, a debt ought to be extinguished in less than nineteen years, by the payment of principal and interest, on the ground that one generation has no right to tax a future. Now this would be a great improvement on the present practices of governments, and, we believe, is a principle that has not yet been recognised by any. But, by this principle, it appears that the original sum would be more than twice paid: why should it? If the original sum borrowed ought, in justice, to be paid twice over, why not three times, four times, or *ad infinitum?* Why not?

Cannot some of our men of talent and learning, some of the "business community," answer these questions? They must be answered, and that, too, satisfactorily, because the producers of the wealth of the world want to know why, or wherefore, that those who produce nothing, should claim the ownership of everything? Producers of wealth, ask yourselves why? Not only why should one generation be allowed to saddle another with their own debts, but why the same generation should be compelled to pay the same debt twice over? Producers of wealth,

the duty of abolishing these "*paradoxical and unnatural institutions*," devolves on you.

The following article appeared lately in one of the public papers, and is admirably calculated to illustrate the pernicious, degrading and enslaving nature of permanent funded debts:

"THE TWO PRESENTS.—A gentleman, fifty years ago, gave his daughter, at her birth, a diamond ring which cost fifteen hundred dollars, which she still has in her possession, and will no doubt continue to remain in the family. Another gentleman, [of more sagacity of course,] at the same time, gave his daughter fifteen hundred dollars in money, which was invested for her use at seven per cent., compound interest; and as no part of the amount was used, the sum, at this day, has accumulated to forty-four thousand one hundred and eighty-two dollars and fifty cents! while the other lady's diamond ring remains at its original value."

And so also would the money have remained at its original value, but for the existence of our unjust, "*unnatural and paradoxical institutions*." By what operation of enchantment is it that any *thing* can, in fifty years, or in any length of time whatever, become *two thousand nine hundred and forty-five times* more valuable than itself, merely because the owner of it did not use it? For this is the true state of the case, and is a question that cannot be answered, except by attributing it to the existence of our unjust "*unnatural and paradoxical institutions*." For it is a self-evident proposition, that *no thing whatever* can possibly ever become more valuable than itself. This mysterious result cannot be accomplished by means of a house, a coat, nor a hat, nor by anything short of the almighty dollar; neither could it be done by that, if the human intellect had not been bewildered and confounded by the money jugglers of the world.

Here we perceive an individual in the ownership of fifteen hundred dollars, which she did not choose to use herself, but lent it to another. At the end of fifty years, it is found that, after returning the original sum, (fifteen hundred dollars,) there is still due the lender the enormous sum of forty-two thousand six hundred and eighty-two dollars—or the same number of ounces of solid silver, which is about 2,761 pounds avoirdupois, or one ton, 761 pounds, for which the receiver is exonerated, *by law*, from

giving the least shadow of an equivalent, yet it requires 273 years of hard labor and toil to accumulate or earn it; which is two thousand nine hundred and forty five times greater than the original sum. Now if we divide this sum by 156, which is as many dollars as any working man can make in a year over and above his own keeping, being fifty cents per day, and is a very liberal allowance, we shall find it will require a man, so employed in unremitting toil, 273 years to accumulate this sum! It is impossible for it to be accumulated, except at the expense of so much labor. The question then is, *who gets the money and who performs the labor?* The analysis shows us that, if we allow thirty years for the period which a man is able only to apply himself to daily hard labor, *ninety-one human beings* must devote the most valuable portion of their lives to perpetual toil, slavery and degradation, in order that *one* may devote *but a single life to useless idleness!*

Thus is produced in society, "*satiety on the one hand—starvation on the other.*" Is this right? Is it just? Will any honest man advocate the existence of such "*unnatural and paradoxical institutions*" for one moment? Surely not. Is it any wonder that the working classes are doomed to poverty and pauperism? Is it any wonder that so many of the poor are vicious and corrupt, when laws and customs, which produce such results, are called by the rich *good*? Can we expect the people to become virtuous and happy while controlled by their influence? We might as reasonably expect to see "the pine apple flourish in a bed of snow."

The working classes alone can remove these evils: it is a holy duty they owe to humanity, their own immediate happiness, and the well-being of their offspring. They can do this perhaps most successfully, by uniting under the National Reform organization,—the freedom of the public lands from the all-grasping hand of the element-speculator being the first step necessary to be taken, for no man can ever be a *free man* so long as he is denied a right to the soil. But so long as laws are so, they must be respected; and it is only by an inviolable adherence to them, that we can ever hope to succeed. Therefore, whatever we do, let it be done legally, peaceably, decently, and in order; the ballot box being the only cure. Come one, come all, join heart and hand to put this monstrous evil down. BE FREE MEN!

CHAPTER XV.

THE BANKING SYSTEM.

"SIRE, [said Helvetius to Frederic the great, in alluding to some petitions for monopolies, you need not trouble yourself to read them through; they all speak the same language. We beseech your Majesty to grant us leave to rob your people of such a sum; in consideration of which, we engage to pay you a certain share of the pillage."—*Lord Brougham.*

The proper name for a Bank charter would be, a license to plunder the people; and a bonus is a share of the plunder.

Professor Vethake, of the University of Pennsylvania, in his work on Political Economy—after detailing the many pernicious and ruinous consequences resulting to a community by the means of bank expansions and contractions, and noticing the immense profits realised by the paper money making gentry from the suffering public—thus expresses himself, at page 178:

"Profits, too, made in this manner, cannot be classed with those which result from *ordinary gaming:* they are *precisely* of the same nature with the winnings of the gambler, who uses *false dice*, or marked cards, unknown to his victim; and the act of obtaining them is deserving of no milder epithet than that of *swindling, or robbery.*"

Our object is not to attach blame to the individuals who make use of these objectionable powers, because there is no use in having power except we use it: the wrong is in our legislatures granting them, which they have no right to do; or if they have, then is our Declaration of Independence nothing but a humbug, "as sounding brass, and a tinkling cymbal."

About the year 1831, Mr. Stephen Simpson, who was for many years Cashier of the United States Bank, published a book called "The Working Man's Manual," in which the evils of the banking system are portrayed with a masterly

hand, evincing a perfect understanding of the subject; and certainly, no man could be better qualified to write such a book than said Mr. Simpson, he having had many years experience in the business. He writes thus, on page 48:

"It is a singular infatuation, prevailing among all modern writers on Political Economy, that scarcity of food among the laboring people is attributable to excess of population, whilst the palpable fact was staring them in the face, that the excess of bloated accumulation in the rich, demonstrated the falsity of the hypothesis.

At page 86, he says:

"The stinted measure of the wages of labor may justly be termed the *Evil Principle* of the age. If we substitute *Capital*, *Banks*, and *Monopolies*, for the Barons, Lords and Bishops of the feudal times, we shall realize a juncture so precisely similar, as to carry out in full an illustration of the abuses under which the sons of laber now suffer oppression and injustice. What, but a principle of slavery, could have made it a felony for a working man to demand the true and just wages for his labor? If mechanics combine to raise their wages, the laws punish them as conspirators against the good of society, and the dungeon awaits them as it does the robber But the laws have made it a just and meritorious act, that *capitalists shall combine* to strip the man of labor of his earnings, and reduce him to a dry crust and a gourd of water. [And, we add, when he has produced for his master more wealth than he knows how to make use of, must himself be condemned to dirth by starvation.] Thus does power invert justice, and derange the order of nature. He who sows, shall reap—he who builds, shall inhabit—he who produces, shall possess! This is the dictate of nature, justice, reason, instinct, and common sense. But this instinct is crushed by the power of *Capital and Law.*

"Why should the working classes be stripped of the fruits of their labor? Simply because they are defenceless, and because custom has, from time immemorial, classed them with slaves and servants."

Law and Capital have abolished the law of immutable justice, and, in lieu thereof, have decided that, he that sows, shall not reap—he that builds, shall not inhabit—he that produces, shall not possess; and those that neither sow, reap, build or produce anything, *shall possess all things.* Again, Mr. Simpson says, page 87:

"And must wealth be still pampered, because it is capital? Must capital still be allowed to absorb ninety per cent. of the wages of labor, because the rich must be flattered, the idle conciliated, the great humored and adulated at the sacrifice of justice, science, liberty, good government, and general happiness? because the laws of despotic antiquity adjust the wages of labor, instead of the instinct of reason and justice? Capitalists live and grow rich by the labor of others. The laboring man lives by his own industry, enriches others by it, but seldom ever grows rich himself. Is this just? [Surely not.] By no other means than fraud, monopoly, and unjust distribution of labor, could the *idle few* grow rich, and the *industrious majority* remain poor. But not only is capital a monopoly, but it causes credit to become a monopoly, confined to the *idle few* and denied to the *laboring majority*, who are thus pressed down, by a double act of injustice and oppression, to poverty and want.

"It has, certainly, been too much the disposition of those who riot in palaces, to hold the working people in contempt; looking down upon them with a glance of scorn, and arrogating a right not only to undervalue their importance in the scale of being, but extort their hard earnings in virtue of the *monopoly of Capital; for capital is naturally an* [unfeeling] *tyrant*, always standing on the alert to grind down the operative, who can only live from hand to mouth, and who *must* sell because he *must* eat, [or die by starvation.] Capital commands all the passions and faculties of a people—it buys all they produce at half price—it keeps them in a state of perpetual labor without enjoyment, and smiles at its own power and superiority; *while the wretch it fattens on, shrinks, withers and dies*, from the very famine it imposes on him.

"Capital being, then, naturally, a tyrant, it ought never [as a matter of policy or prudence, we suppose he means,] to receive vigor and nourishment from public opinion—from unequal institutions—from legal monopolies—from imaginary horrors of public journals; *lest the working people should awaken to a due sense of their real importance in the scale of society*, and shaking off their lethargy, and treading their ignorance and ideas of servitude under foot, *rouse themselves to a proper vindication of their violated rights*, and demand a restitution of their extorted labor, through legal edactments and constitutional ordinances. We propose no wrong to capital, nor capitalists, but that they shall do no wrong in law and equity*—leaving them even all the wrong which they naturally and inevitably commit from the sweeping immensity of their power. And, to obtain this, [legal aid, in support of their unjust and tyrannical operations,] terror is affected, and revolution

* This expression appears to us a solecism, for how can wrong exist in equity? In law it may, but not in equity.

forebodingly deprecated! If this is not adding insult to oppression, it is certainly seeking to conceal error amidst the fogs of absurdity, and the philosophy of romance.

"The faculties of man were bestowed upon him to ensure his comfort; *for that he labors*, and that he would always accomplish, if industrious, but for the intervention of injustice, the power of fraud, and oppression of capital in its various forms and attitudes.

"The cant of capital has ascribed pauperism to prodigality; but the voice of science refers it to avarice [in the rich]. The class of paupers seldom have a chance of wasting a patrimony—their only inheritance being misery and rags. A thousand are born paupers, for one who becomes so by waste and extravagance. Pauperism has been considered, by some, as a constituent of national wealth. It is so on the existing system, but is not a constituent of national justice. To provide for the poor, ought not to engage the attention of the people, or excite the ingenuity of philosophers; when it is so easy to prevent pauperism by giving to industry its legitimate function of distributing its own labor, and thus affording competence to every member of society of industrious habits, physical health, and robust manhood.

At page 89, Simpson says:

"It is a fallacy to imagine that we are aiming to controvert the established legitimate doctrines of political economy; as it respects the principles of supply and demand, and other contingencies that regulate the market, or subject *labor and property* [we consider them synonymous] to the vicissitudes of times, seasons and accidents. Our object reaches higher—is more rational, and more laudable. It strikes at a *fundamental principle* in the distribution of wealth; that *labor* shall share with *capital* in an equitable ratio. And as capital is vested in the *few*, and labor resides in the *many*, it only requires that the latter combine to bring government into their own hands to secure all they desire. At first, the struggle would be great and arduous; but perseverance and concord, on *expansive grounds*, must finally lead to a signal triumph."

Such are the observations of Stephen Simpson, cashier of the late United States Bank, on the injustice and rapacity—the blighting, withering, pauper-making tendency of the monopoly of capital. No doubt the reader will be surprised at the apparent anomaly of an individual enjoying a snug birth in the bosom of the very mother nurse of all those iniquitous, man-degrading, tyrannical institutions, of which he so bitterly but justly complains. This appa-

rent mystery shall be cleared up in the proper place. Previous to which, we shall take some notice of his views in respect of a particular branch of the monopoly of capital, namely: that of banking and paper money.

"All moneyed corporations are taxes upon industry: and every bank bill that issues, carries a burden upon labor. The taxation is indirect, to be sure, but it is not the less effectual [and positive]; it is not the less onerous than imposts on consumption; it is not so light and innoxious as a direct tax of the same amount."

Now, surely, the wisdom and experience, nor the sincerity of Mr. Simpson, can be doubted on this subject—he being an old experienced banker. The passage will be found at page 157, "Working Man's Manual."

"The currency of a country, to be sound and wholesome, ought to be equivalent to the precious metals, or the metals themselves, and not the *suppositious* representative of *property;* which property may diminish *one-half* in the process of realization before the gold and silver are obtained for it. Thus, suppose a bank to stop payment—in fact, they are becoming bankrupt every day!—the holders of their notes must wait one, two, or three years for their dividends; and, when made, they never exceed fifty per cent. of the capital. So that we see the fact demonstrated before us, that bank bills do not even represent labor or commodities, and very often represent nothing but the mere monopoly of public credit. It must be obvious, that a paper currency of this kind is calculated to throw the measure of value into utter confusion, and subject property to the winds and waves of every shock which its collision with the metals is sure to produce. The crisis of 1819 in our currency exhibited the disastrous effects of paper credits, [bank debts or expansions,] when, in many instances, estates that had cost $40,000, were reduced in value (by a collapse of the currency) to $18,000; and hundreds of men of fortune, who deemed themselves exalted into opulence and luxury, became suddenly reduced to poverty, or compelled, a second time, to begin at the task of labor. Such horrible conjunctures ought to be avoided by a sagacious and provident people, for they up-tear the very foundation of the national wealth and prosperity, eat into private happiness, and corrode away the resources of the country, and produce embarrassment in all its fiscal concerns.

"The first effect produced by *paper issues*, is a rise of prices; and this, by many, is mistaken for a symptom of prosperity and riches; and such a condition of prosperity it does, in fact, indicate,

when the increase is owing to the increase of industry, instead of the augmentation of bank paper. A reference to our *bank reports* will show an average augmentation of paper over specie capital of 300 per cent; say for every one hundred thousand dollars in specie, four hundred thousand dollars in paper are afloat. This artificial enhancement of capital is not, however, an increase of riches, for it gives us no new stock of possessions; it merely converts into *activity* the old stock of our industry; and we only pass from one to another, in the shape of *bank notes*, our houses, lots, farms, &c. The consequence is, the *prices* of all other kinds of property rise to nearly the ratio of the expansion of the currency; 'and it requires *four times* as much of the paper to buy a house, &c., as it would if no paper existed; and this leads to the delusion, that because you receive more money for your commodities, [or labor, or wages,] you are so much the richer; overlooking the fact, that this rise of prices is general, and that whatever you purchase, you have to pay *four prices* for; so that, in fact, you are no richer than if you received but *one-fourth* of the amount in coin."

Now this fact the working man should never lose sight of, neither should he forget that wages are the *first* thing to fall, and the *last* to rise. And if the working classes should happen to combine to raise their wages, they are frequently thrown into prison! But the paper-money maker gets a special act of government to enable him to raise his wages three or four hundred per cent. at a stroke! and, instead of being thrown into a prison, is awarded a palace, and a coach, and also the honor and respect of his fellow citizens! Is this right? Is it just? or is it in accordance with the principles of our boasted "Declaration of Independence?"

Mr. Simpson has given the truth in regard to the nature of bank paper: it accords with our experience, and his authority is indisputable.

And, surely, no honest man, who understands the subject, can advocate or sustain this unjust, man-degrading, pauper-making contrivance for one moment. To expand and contract the currency of a country by means of bank paper, produces the same consequences in a community precisely as if all the weights and measures in the country had been increased and diminished by the silly dictum of a despot, or as if the coin had been debased to the same extent. Almost all writers on Political Economy agree on this point.

We shall now let Mr. Simpson give us a description of "*A Bank Bill*," which he does in the following language, page 141:

"What is a Bank Bill? It is an order for so much money, or labor, drawn upon the producer of labor. Its acceptance, receipt and circulation, is tantamount to the payment of an order upon the person receiving it.

"Suppose a farmer sells twenty barrels of his flour for a bank note of $100. The note is an order to take from him this amount of *real property*, and leave him a $100 bank bill. This bill, in itself, is worth [comparatively] nothing—it has no [exchangable] value—it is but the mere presumption, appealing to his *faith*, that it will bring him one hundred dollars in gold, silver, or [a proportionate amount of other products of] labor. Acting on this presumption, he travels to town to purchase goods, which, having done, he offers in payment the $100 note. The store-keeper tells him the bank has stopped, or broke! In this manner the luckless farmer has parted with his *hundred dollars* [or as many *days' labor*, or *ounces of silver*] for a SHADOW; and his property has passed into the hands of the adroit speculator. In many ways his $100 note may prove equally worthless; but, taken at the best advantage, it has this detrimental property, that it can never purchase an equal amount of any commodity that his hundred dollars worth of labor would command, supposing the paper money had no existence.

"Such is the character and operation of every bank bill, and every treasury note, or public stock certificate. It is a draft from capital, *drawn upon labor at sight*, and paid by *public credulity*, faith, or, what is sometimes termed, credit. The party that profits, and the only one in this transaction of *fiction and fraud*, is the banker, the stockholder and speculator; who are generally a trinity, or the three combined in one. By this operation, the banks make use of the entire property of the community for their own exclusive profit, interest and usury. They draw bills upon our lands, our houses, stores, ships, and every species of real [property or] labor, upon which they make, [illegal per centage to an enormous amount,] besides causing an increase of prices, that prove highly pernicious to the industry of the country in its competition with foreigners.

"The only specious argument in favor of bank credits, has been founded on the fact, that they throw into circulation all the labor of the community, and thus stimulate trade by the increase of *fictitious money;* [or, in other words, by a circulation of *bank debts*]. And for whose profit and benefit is this *fictitious circulation?* Exclusively for that of the *stockholder*, and never, in any degree, for that of the *producer*, upon whose labor he thus freely draws at pleasure. It is *labor* that pays the bank bill—it is *labor* that pays the

interest; and after thus paying capital and interest for the exclusive benefit of the idle class of stockholders, how can it be possible that the producers should not suffer under the double burden of sustaining the idle pampering the rapacious, and gratifying the *gambler*, who, as professor Vethake says, plays with loaded dice, or marked cards, unknown to his plundered victim.

"A Bank Bill, then, it will be seen from the foregoing remarks, is, in itself, *worth nothing*—that its whole worth is derived from *labor*, which pays it at the moment it comes into circulation—that the bank gives it no value whatever; [no, but the borrower does, by surrendering his real property in exchange for it;] for when it returns to the bank, it is no longer a *credit*—that it is no money, nor gold, nor silver, nor equivalent to gold and silver, possessing in itself no single property of preciousness, stability or usefulness; [but is a debt owed by the banker to the holder, on which he draws interest as though it contained as many ounces of silver as there were dollars printed upon the face of it. Hence it is evident that *the more a bank is in debt, the greater is its income!* which is a palpable absurdity, and a gross violation of right and justice.]

"The complaint, then, justly exists, that government, being bound to secure to every citizen *equal rights*, should have ventured to delegate to corporations an absolute power over the *labor of the producer*, by placing it at the disposal of these bills of credit: [or, rather, these false money makers.] Where is the *security of property*, under this artificial mode of causing it to change hands without the intervention of equivalents? In fine, where is the happiness of society, when thus placed at the mercy and discretion of a privileged order of speculators, whose attribute of sovereignty is an entire control over the property, fortune and happiness of man; who can at pleasure deprive him of the fruits of his industry—reduce him to poverty, or compel him to become the tenant of a poor-house, a dungeon, [or an untimely grave?]

"This power, however, of corporations over the mass of society, would be less culpable and less intolerable, if it were exercised with a spirit of equal oppression over all. But the hardship is exclusively to those who labor; and the benefit entirely restricted to the pampered sons of idleness and capital. *Industry* is the *victim*—*idleness* the *victor*. Under these circumstances, why should *public credulity* continue a slave to this *oppressive fraud*? [this legal system of robbery?] The reason is, because the public understanding is not enlightened. Let every man come to have a proper conception of [the true nature of] a *bank bill*, and society will unanimously unite to put down the fraud, and return to the use of *realities* and the measure of value and justice in the exchanges of trade. "It has been well observed by a profound writer,* that govern-

* Taylor.

ments have no more right to grant charters for the purpose of uttering fictitious money, than they have to incorporate a company for the object of granting *patents* for lands already settled by the proprietors. [And, we add, or grant licenses to individuals to rob the public on the highway.] For, to circulate a bank bill, is as essentially an invasion of property and social right, as to sell land over again. In fine, bank notes do, in effect, transfer land anew, as we have already pointed out by the constant fluctuation of the measure of value; and the power to manufacture bank notes is, in substance, a power to absorb labor, and acquire property without the intervention of an equivalent."

And, we add, is one of those ingenious, pauper-making contrivances, invented by the avarice and cupidity of the short-sighted, cold-hearted, selfish capitalist, for the purpose of keeping a majority of mankind in perpetual and slavish toil and misery; and, finally, cause them to die of starvation, in order that a few may secure to themselves all the riches, all the refinement, all the comfort, and all the enjoyment, as Mr. Colquhoun says.

Such, then, were the views of Mr. Simpson, of the nature of paper money, and of the injustice of its operation and blighting influence on the happiness of the working classes. He says all that we have quoted, and much more of the same character; but we think the foregoing sufficient to convince any honest seeker after truth, that paper money, in any form, is nothing more than a blighting curse on the happiness of any nation that makes use of it. We occasionally added a few words (in brackets) in some of his sentences, to make them more emphatic; but in no case has he been misrepresented. We should be sorry to do it.

A bank note never did, nor never can, pay or cancel a debt, is very evident. Suppose Tom owes Dick ten dollars, and gives him a ten dollar bank note as payment; Dick is no more paid than he was before—the difference is only this: that the bank has become debtor to Dick instead of Tom, and is then a creditor of the bank, and remains such until he realizes ten dollars worth of real property; that is, an equivalent of the products of labor. Therefore a circulation of bank notes is nothing but a circulation of bank debts, and the deluded creditors pay an enormous tax for the privilege of trusting the banks—thus reversing the common order of justice: *the real debtor* claims and *receives interest*, and the *creditor* is obliged to pay it. The obliga-

tion of the banks to redeem their promises, is all a delusion, because they can no more pay *three* dollars with *one*, than a poverty-stricken beggar can pay *two* dollars with *nothing*. The main circumstance which inspires the public with confidence in the circulation of bank debts, is a knowledge that a charter secures to the banks, when the creditors become clamorous for payment, the *power to seize upon and sacrifice the property of others, for the purpose of paying their own debts!*

Besides all the foregoing evils, a bank charter annuls and sets aside good and wholesome laws for the sole benefit of the banker, and to the manifest injury of the public. If an individual, who had no charter, should take a dollar and add sufficient base metal to make three of it, and put them into circulation, he would be justly consigned to the penitentiary. But the already rich banker who gets a charter may put into circulation millions of dollars that do not cost him three cents a piece, is not sent to the penitentiary: oh, no; his charter absolves him from all iniquity, and entitles him to honor and respect. Yet the counterfeiter's dollars cost him at least thirty-three cents a piece besides his own labor. And the law makes the counterfeiter a *villain*, but the banker an *honest gentleman!* Is this even-handed justice? Surely not.

From the remarks just made, it will be seen that the law establishing the value, or, in better words, the weight and fineness of the coin, is made null and void in favor of the banker by means of a bank charter.

Another general law made null and void by this beautiful contrivance, is the law regulating the interest on money. The law limits interest at six per cent., but when banks have in circulation three times as many dollars of promises as they have real dollars invested, they are realizing eighteen per cent., instead of six. Therefore this law is made null and void by a bank charter, and reverses the order of justice. This is a very ingenious method by which the rich man can multiply his property without cost, but the poor man is denied the privilege; yet if any one can have a just claim for it, surely it is the poor man, not the rich.

A specious argument in favor of a paper currency used by its advocates, is, its remarkable cheapness, and the convenience it affords a community of supplying it in suffi-

cient quantities to meet the wants of the public. Here, then, lies the mischief; a paper currency is just as *worthless* as it is *cheap*. It is cheap only to the makers—it represents more than fifty times the amount of labor that it costs to make it—every dollar represents nearly an ounce of silver, though it never cost the maker a ninetieth part of it. Now this cheap currency is worth what it *costs the maker, but no more;* yet the public are obliged to pay for the use of it *what it represents*, namely, nearly one ounce of silver for every dollar, or an equal amount of other products of the working man's labor. Here, then, lies the fraud and injustice—the most successful juggling trick ever practised upon poor credulous man. So, in fact, this cheap currency costs the public much more than one composed exclusively of gold and silver—its wear, tear and destruction being immense.

The demand for money is unlimited; and in this lies the difference between it and other products of labor, or articles of commerce. Their production is limited by demand, and demand is limited by the people's wants, or their ability to consume: not so with money; there is no limit to the want of it. Therefore the production of gold and silver is, by a wise provision of Providence, limited in the nature of things by existing in but few places, and being unattainable except by bestowing the requisite quantity of labor upon it. In consequence of this wise provision, it is impossible to either increase or diminish the quantity suddenly; and which, above all things, ought to be avoided, because expansions injure all creditors, and contractions injure all debtors. Another pretext for the use of bank paper is, that there is not sufficient money in the country to transact its business. If bank paper will supply the deficiency, the argument is a good one; but, alas! all our experience proves most positively that it produces no such effect, but just the reverse; the more banking the less money we have. All writers on the subject agree on this point. If there is not money enough in a country to transact its business, where, in the name of common sense, will the banker get the money to pay the holders of his promises when required to fulfill them? A bank note being an order drawn upon the producer of wealth, payable at sight, is but an evidence of debt. When these debts circulate to a large amount, the people become deluded

by observing with what rapidity the products of labor change owners, and the unusual high prices, mistake this state of things for prosperity, when the fact is, we are but plunging into a quagmire of debt, disaster and ruin, from which nothing can relieve us but one of those most "*paradoxical* and *unnatural*" of all laws, *a General Bankrupt Law!*

Gold and silver being the products of labor, are, therefore, real wealth or property; the aggregate of which, at any time in circulation, constitutes the standard or measure of the value of all other commodities subject to purchase and sale;—and to alter or interfere with this just and natural standard by any fictitious means, by governments or privileged corporations, is a gross violation of the rights of humanity, and ought not to be submitted to, or tolerated by the producers of wealth. No person can justly become possessed of gold and silver but by producing it, or by giving in exchange as much of his own labor, time, or services, as was required to produce it. And if he obtains them in any other way, it is either by *force* or *fraud*—kings and capitalists obtain them by no other means.

Now, surely, no working man, or producer of wealth, who understands the mischief-working, enslaving, pauper-making tendency of banking institutions, will be so biased by prejudice as deliberately to cast his vote in favor of their continuance; however, every man must be his own judge.

To show that we are not alone in these views, we shall let some of our most eminent statesmen speak for themselves. In Sparks' Life of Washington, vol. 9, page 231, will be found a letter from the General to Thomas Stone, of Maryland, in which will be found the following language:

"I do not scruple to declare that, if I had a voice in your legislature, it would have been given decidedly against a paper emission, upon the general principles of its utility as a representative, and the necessity of it as a medium. I contend that it is by the *substance*, not with the *shadow* of a thing, that we are to be benefitted. The wisdom of man, in my humble opinion, cannot devise a plan by which the credit of paper money would be long supported; consequently depreciation keeps pace with the quantity of the emission, and articles for which it is exchanged rise in a greater ratio than the sinking value of the money. Wherein, then, is the farmer, the planter, the artizan benefitted? The debtor may be,

because, as I have observed, he gives the *shadow* in lieu of the *substance;* and, in proportion to his gain, the creditor or the body politic suffers. An evil equally great is the door it immediately opens for speculation, by which the least designing, and, perhaps, most valuable part of the community, are preyed upon by the more knowing and crafty speculators."—*Washington.*

John Q. Adams, being written to by a political friend, soliciting his opinions upon Banks, Bankers and Paper Money, relative to their influence upon society at large, says:

"As to bankers, there is little difference between them and the counterfeiters;—if I should give any preference, the counterfeiter is the best, for neither of them ever expected nor intended to pay their notes. The banker, more bold and daring, robs the people under cover and pretence of Law; [he should have said, *protection of law;*] the counterfeiter, more diffident and unassuming, robs the people without law."—*J. Q. Adams.*

"Whoever shall attempt to restore the fallen credit of the country by creating new banks, merely that they may create new paper, and that government may have a chance of borrowing where it has not borrowed before, will find himself miserably deceived. The bank which will be erected by this bill, is of a most extraordinary, and, as I think, alarming nature."

Danl. Webster, H. Rep., June 2nd, 1815.

"Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none is so effectual as that which deludes with paper money! It is the most perfect expedient ever invented for fertilizing the rich man's soil by the sweat of the poor man's brow."

Danl. Webster, U. S. Senate, 1812.

"It will be vain to talk of public credit, until we return to the pure, unmixed circulation of standard gold and silver."

John Adams to Col. Joseph Crawford, Oct. 28, 1809.

"The system of banking we have both equally and ever reprobated. *I contemplate it as a blot left in our institutions,* which, if not corrected, will end in their destruction, which is already hit by gamblers in corruption, and is sweeping away in its progress the fortunes and morals of our citizens. And I sincerely believe, with you, that banking establishments are more dangerous than Standing Armies."—*Thos. Jefferson to J. Taylor. Jeff's. Cor.,* v. 4, p. 274.

"I am, and ever have been, opposed to all kinds of government paper currency, let it be derived from exchequer or otherwise. If

the paper is the real representative of specie, why not pay the debts in specie, and let the specie circulate in the hands of the producing classes? Then the dealings between the merchant and the laborer will be in specie, and the merchant, by making a deposit, can get a bill of exchange on any part of the Union, [which will answer a much better purpose than a bank bill.] Where, then, is the use of a paper currency? Neither the merchant nor laborer wants it. The merchant wants a *bill*—not a bank or e chequer bill—but upon a banker where he lays in his goods. [The merchant wants a bill of exchange—a bill that does not bear a falsehood upon its face—one that will not come back for payment. And the producer wants no bill at all, but an equivalent for his labor—not a banker's debt.] It is one of the greatest humbugs ever attempted to be imposed upon a people, that there is not specie enough in the world to answer all the necessary wants of the community. *Shut out from circulation all paper, and specie will flow upon us as the tide;* but it will never flow to any country that has a paper currency which will always depreciate. A national paper currency is a great curse to any people, and a particular curse to the laborer of any country, for its depreciation always falls on the producing classes."—*Andrew Jackson to M. Dawson*, 1840.

"I am not a bank man; I once was, and then they cheated me out of every dollar I had placed in their hands."

Wm. H. Harrison's Dayton Speech.

Such is the testimony of our most eminent statesmen. They denounced the Banking system in the most energetic language—not when being candidates for public office, but in the calm retirement of private life, in correspondence with their particular friends. We, therefore, rationally conclude them sincere. Surely, the united wisdom of these gentlemen, under such circumstances, is not to be overlooked or disregarded; and, further, let us not forget that they were the champions of Republican Institutions.

We shall now add the testimony of another eminent statesmen, but an enemy to Republicanism, and who, no doubt, enjoyed much pleasure in the anticipation of his own prediction. "Let the Americans," said Wm. Pitt, "adopt their Funding system, and go on with their Banking institutions, and their boasted independence will be a mere phantom." Reader, reflect deeply on this prediction—decide accordingly.

Now, according to Judge Hall's doctrine, those eminent tatesmen, namely: Gen. Washington, John Adams, J. Q.

Adams, Daniel Webster, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and William H. Harrison, inasmuch as they have unanimously denounced the banking system, and have "stigmatized their business as inimical to the liberty and prosperity of the country," *ought to be branded as political demagogues*, because "they teach the laborer and mechanic to dislike the banker, and imbue the farmer's mind with a deadly hatred of his vocation; yet his (the banker's) means furnish all with daily employment, and without whose existence the farmer's crops would rot upon the field." So says the Judge.

We must beg leave to dissent from the Judge in this case, because, when those individuals uttered the sentiments attributed to them, they were not on the floor of Congress, advocating the exclusive interests of the particular clique, class or party, that had sent them, but had retired from the stormy sea of party politics to the shades of private life. We shall, therefore, set them down, not as demagogues and incendiaries, but as honest patriots.

We shall now condense the subject of Banking into a few words, by showing the difference between a common promissory note and a bank note—which is this:—The drawer and issuer of a promissory note, draws upon *his own labor, property or services*, and *pays interest* in proportion to his indebtedness; but the banker draws upon *the labor, property, or services of others*—claims and *receives interest* in proportion to *his* indebtedness; which is a manifest violation of the order of justice. And those individuals who claim this privilege, ought, at least, show upon what principle of right they found their claims.

The foregoing remarks are only applicable to banks of circulation—such as have power to expand and contract the currency. No reasonable objection can exist to banks of loan and deposit; they are, no doubt, both necessary and useful in all commercial communities. They might issue certificates of actual deposits, without injury to the public, as a large portion of the abrasion, or wear and tear of the coin, would thereby be prevented. Such certificates could not depreciate below par, but, on the contrary, would generally bear a small premium, which, in the aggregate, would nearly equal the abrasion and cost of transportation of the coin. Under such a course, we should have all the advantages that can be derived from

the use of a paper currency, with none of its evils; and from this point commences the injustice and dishonesty of banking. Let capitalists compete with each other as the working classes do—free the public lands from the iron grasp of the speculator, as contended for by "National Reformers;" and all will be well. The working classes ask for no special privilege; all they ask is, *equal rights FOR ALL;* which is but reasonable.

It is now necessary the reader should be apprised of the why and wherefore Mr. Simpson should write such a work as he did. He has, in the clearest and most masterly manner, exposed to public view the iniquity and injustice of the banking system, and its tendency to strip industry of its just reward, and to reduce the working classes to a state of poverty, degradation, and hopeless dependence. Himself being a banker, it appears rather strange that he should publish such a work; but the thing is easily explained.

In the absence of all other evidence, "Simpson's Working Man's Manual" is sufficient to prove, most conclusively, the truth of what we have asserted in a previous part of this work—that justice, religion and morality, have been prostituted and sacrificed, in order to build up and promote the arrogant, grasping claims of the capitalist. Mr. Simpson's object, in publishing his work, was to wheedle, or, as Judge Hall would say, to "cajole and flatter the working classes, because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot-boxes," into the notion of voting in favor of having the United States Bank rechartered. His book winds up with an appendix, which, at page 242, opens thus:

"THE BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

"All general principles are liable to exceptions. In a country where the monopoly of banking is carried to a great extent, it may often become necessary to *check one monopoly by another*, [honest reader, here is the cloven foot standing out in bold relief—here is the *key to the mystery*,] and *oppose the interest* of those who have nothing to restrain their cupidity, *by the interest of another party* who have controlling *motives of integrity to regulate their conduct.* [What modesty and disinterestedness! the interest and conduct of a monster bank to be regulated by '*motives of integrity!*'—capital idea.] Upon a just theory, framed for the *equitable distribution of*

property, no paper money should prevail; but where institutions do exist for its manufacture to an unlimited extent, another question presents itself—whether the over-issues of the local banks may not be beneficially controlled by the *higher obligations* imposed on the Bank of the United States, to preserve a metallic currency, [as it did in the year 1837,] and, by the *combined influence* of the *funds of government* with those of its *stockholders*, [and of the *State banks*,] hold a salutary restraint over the temptation which always exists to bankruptcy when the currency of a country is placed at the discretion of private cupidity and chartered companies? [as realized in the year 1840.]

"In this view the question arises, whether the Bank of the United States *is not to be preferred* to any unknown or odious system which might take its place, were the people to suffer it to be destroyed."

So says Mr. Simpson. Now this is amply sufficient to show, most clearly, that his work is a mere *gull-trap*, intended to "cajole and flatter the working classes, because they are the most numerous and wield the greatest power at the ballot-boxes to their own injury," by persuading them to fasten upon themselves an institution which would have both the power and will to strip them of the fruits of their industry, and reduce them to a state of servitude, dependence, poverty and pauperism, under the plea of doing them good! Yet, this gentleman, at page 12 of his work, thus describes the influence of such an institution:

"In itself, or its consequences, the *funding system*, of all the perversions of this otherwise equitable government, *is especially oppressive to the children of labor*. If it did not create a fiscal necessity, it at least afforded a plausible pretext for the BANKING SYSTEM,—*that fruitful mother of unutterable affliction to the sons of industry*,—which brought us, at one fatal step, into the vortex of English aristocracy—overgrown fortunes and hopeless poverty —taxation through all the elements of existence; and speculation, to the utter grinding down of the *producer*, to pamper the fortunes of the rich and swell the hoard of the avaricious speculator. The *banking system* and the *public funds* are, in the fiscal world, precisely what the royal grants were in the landed interest of England. They created even a *greater inequality of fortune*, by means *more nefarious* as well as *more pernicious;* for they levied a tax directly upon every commodity produced by labor; which tax became immediately absorbed into the pocket of the capitalist. So that what England did through her royal charters and grants, antecedent to

the Revolution, our own aristocracy deliberately committed through the funding and banking systems; whose results, upon the happiness and comfort of an industrious and free people, must be estimated fully as calamitous, in respect to the working classes, as the consequences that would attend the subjugation of the country by a foreign king, who should partition the property of the conquered people among his chiefs and followers, in large and princely domains—thus creating a monopoly of land and capital, which would extort labor [from the producer] *upon their own terms; a bare subsistence.*"

Such a pernicious working system as this, Mr. Simpson would induce the working classes to engraft, like an incubus, upon society, by deliberately casting their votes, at the ballot-boxes, in its favor. What for? For the purpose of enabling the capitalist to monopolize the land, the credit, the money, with all the products of the poor man's labor, in order that they may gormandize *all the riches, all the comforts, and all the enjoyments.* Mr. Simpson thus continues:

"Thus far, then, we perceive our constitution of *equal rights* to be *the merest untenanted skeleton of liberty that the imagination of man can conceive;* which, by its *operation*, creates aristocracy, privileges, extortion, monopoly, and overgrown fortunes; and which, by its *letter*, declares that *equality of rights* shall be guaranteed to all, and the pursuit of happiness be a common boon, secured to industry by the equity of her principles and simplicity of her laws. Such are the defects of our organic laws."

Mr. Simpson's proposed plan for the cure of these defects—that of creating a monstrous monster to check and keep in order the little ones—is rather strange, and is apt to remind one of the man that introduced a ferocious tiger into his house for the purpose of keeping the rats and mice in proper subjection. Now, if this gentleman had not intended to "cajole, flatter, and delude the working classes to their own injury," (as Judge Hall says demagogues always do,) instead of recommending the establishment of such an institution as he did, would have told us that it would be perfectly preposterous to expect the monster bank would interpose her power and influence for the purpose of checking, and keeping in proper subjection, the small fry; but, on the contrary, would be most apt, as a

thousand is to one, to court their favor and good feelings, (being all birds of one feather;) so that, in case any difficulty should happen between her and the government, (such as wishing or attempting to examine into her affairs, books, &c.,) she could call in their assistance—combine their power and influence together—assume an attitude of defiance—attack the government—flood the country with worthless promises—corrupt our legislators—stop specie payments—lock up or export the real money; in short, fill the whole country with corruption, bankruptcy and confusion, and then point to government as the cause, while the whole mischief was justly chargeable to herself alone. But Mr. Simpson's object was to "*cajole and flatter the working classes, because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot-boxes.*" He has written a whole chapter to prove the *impossibility* of having *a mixed currency.* To talk of it, he says—

"Is to talk of a fiction; [and that] the theory of it has been invented by stipendiaries of banks, in order to reconcile the *producers of wealth* to the frauds and taxes imposed upon them by paper money and banking corporations. It has been defended by saying, that specie being the *foundation* of a paper currency, renders the latter as sound as if it was composed of specie altogether; a sophism so palpably absurd, as to surprise us at its announcement. For how can that be a foundation, which entirely disappears? How can paper be sustained by specie, when the amount of the latter can never be made to cover the former? How can one be equal to one hundred? Gross as this paradox is, it has its believers; for what is too monstrous for ignorance to swallow, or credulity to assent to? A public that would *believe in a mixed currency, would believe anything!*"

After saying all this, and declaring the utter worthlessness of paper money under all circumstances, at pages 244–5, we find the following remarks:

"A pure metallic currency being impracticable, it remains to be considered what species of currency is most convenient, most safe, least variable, and most favorable to private and public credit."

He then earnestly recommends a continuance of the '*United States Bank,*" and thus continues his remarks:

"Gold and silver being too unwieldly for a currency in large amounts, but necessary as a standard of value, and paper being most convenient, but having no value, [in another place he declares it utterly worthless,] it becomes self-evident that, by a PROPER MIXTURE of the two, a medium of exchange is compounded, which, while it *secures property from danger*, [what a joke!] at the same time extends the utmost facility to the circulation of wealth, and the operations of commerce."

Now let the reader turn back and read what the same gentleman has said on the subject of *a mixed currency*. He continues thus, page 245:

"In the bills of this corporation, [United States Bank,] we possess the double property of gold and silver in respect to value, and all the facility of paper credits, without any of their disadvantages. They are gold and silver embodied in a form so portable, so aerial, as to almost realize the idea of magic, and present, in a new aspect, those wonderful inventions of science and philosophy which distinguish the era of steam power, and the application of mathematical science to the annihilation of distance."

There, working men, the story is now told; and the cream of the joke lies in this: that all those pernicious, oppressive, and blighting effects, consequent of all bank issues when brought about by a United States Bank "in the twinkling of an eye," become blessings, and ought, therefore, to be cherished and promoted. And the power of all other banks to rob labor of its just reward to fill the pockets of idle capitalists, and to throw the value of all property into utter confusion, that of the United States Bank magically becomes the safeguard of property, the most equitable distributor of the poor man's labor, "and extends the utmost facilities to the circulation of wealth, and the operations of commerce." O, producers of wealth, how ye have been "cajoled and flattered!"

We shall now place a few of Mr. Simpson's sentiments in juxtaposition, so that the reader may have a clear and condensed view of the subject:

ALL BANKING INSTIUTIONS:

Nature of their Issues, or Bills.

"All moneyed corporations are taxes upon industry, and *every bank bill that issues* carries a burden upon labor. A bank bill is an order for so much money [or other property, or work of labor] drawn upon the *producer* by the *banker*. Its acceptance, receipt and circulation, is tantamount to the payment of an order upon the person receiving it. It is a draft from *capital* drawn upon *labor* at sight, and paid by public credulity, faith, or what is sometimes called credit.

"The party that profits, and the *only one*, in these transactions of *fiction and fraud*, is the *banker*, the *stockholder* and *speculator*. By these operations the banks make use of the *entire property* of the community for their own *exclusive profit, interest and usury!*"—*Page* 142.

"The idea that paper credits represent gold and silver, being an illusion in the very nature of things, it is obvious that society is *duped*, as well as *plundered*, by the *fiction!*"—*Page* 143.

"The *continental money* will never cease to be quoted as an awful admonition to avoid the mischiefs of a national paper currency; the illusion of public faith was dissipated by the reality of a bankrupt nation."—*Page* 170.

A Mixed Currency.

"To talk of a mixed currency is to talk of a fiction. It cannot

UNITED STATES BANK:

Nature of its Issues, or Bills.

[But] "*the bills of this corporation* possess the double property of gold and silver in respect to value, and all the facility of paper credit, without any of their disadvantages!

"They are *gold and silver embodied* in a form so portable, so aerial, as to almost realize the idea of magic!"—*Page* 245.

"The bills of this bank are convertible into specie at pleasure, [witness, years 1837–'8–'9–'40, &c.;] they constitute a universal currency, of equal value in all parts of the Union. And while they possess this *precious property* of an equal and *sound currency*, they also operate as a check upon all other paper credits, imparting the same qualities to them, and exacting a specie responsibility from all institutions that emit this *useful* [to the banker] but dangerous kind of fictitious money; which, without the Bank of the United States, would be wholly a fiction, and essentially a curse!"—*Page* 246.

"This institution operates to secure the solvency of the whole nation, and interposes its benignant power to arrest ruin and bankruptcy throughout the States, [witness, year 1842.] How serious a duty, therefore, devolves upon the people to preserve this institution. Let them ponder on it with solemnity."—*Page* 246.

A Mixed Currency.

[But] "specie being too unwieldly for a currency in large

exist in fact. The theory has been invented by the stipendiaries of banks, [proof in the next column, ☞] in order to reconcile the producers of wealth to the frauds and taxes imposed upon them by the paper money of banking corporations. The most celebrated financiers have attempted to persuade the community that currency is wealth, [proof in the next column, ☞] .ecause they are predicated on the existence of gold and silver. Gross as this paradox is, it has its believers; for what is too monstrous for ignorance to swallow, or credulity to assent to? A public that would believe in a *mixed currency*, would believe in anything," [no matter how absurd and contrary to our experience]—*Pages* 104–5.

amounts, but necessary as a standard of value, it becomes self-evident, that, by a *proper mixture* of the issues of this institution and specie, a medium of exchange is compounded, which, contrasted with any other extensive method of a profitable medium of exchange, combining the standard and invariable property of gold and silver, while it *secures property from danger*,* at the same time extends the utmost facility to the circulation of wealth* and the operations of commerce, no institution can vie with that under consideration, [viz: that of the United States Bank."]—*Pages* 244–5.

Such, then, are the conflicting sentiments of Stephen Simpson, contained in his "Working Man's Manual." O consistency, but thou art indeed a jewel!

This is in perfect keeping with our institutions: everything that is good, and consistently calculated to promote the happiness of the mass of the people, has been sacrificed to gratify the inordinate, insolent claims of capital; and for the proof of which, we need nothing stronger than "Simpson's Working Man's Manual."

We shall now bring up his brother banker, Judge Hall, to scold him a little, and then let them both rest in peace; sincerely hoping that all bankers will soon learn the errors of their ways, become wise, humane, and evince a proper regard for the just rights of their fellow men.

"Under the influence of that fell spirit of demagoguism which has swept over our land, it has become fashionable to flatter the

* The circulation of wealth the gentleman speaks of, is the rapidity with which all wealth passes from the hands of the producer into the pocket af the banker; and the property secured from danger, is that of the *banker and speculator*—not the property of the honest producer.

agricultural and laboring classes, because they are the most numerous, and wield the greatest power at the ballot-boxes; while a systematic effort is made to decry the merchant and the banker, and to stigmatize their business as inimical to the liberty and prosperity of the country. We might pass over these incendiary doctrines, if it were not for the wide-spread mischief which they work, by deluding to their own injury the numerous classes whom they are intended to cajole and flatter. The laborer and mechanic are taught to dislike the banker, whose means furnish them with daily employment, [from motives of pure benevolence!] and the farmer's mind is diligently imbued with a settled hatred for the merchant, without whose assistance his crops would rot upon the field."

Yes, the merchant and banker contrive to relieve the farmer of the incumbrance of his toil-earned wealth, and, in lieu thereof, leave him in possession of their worthless promises, which cost nothing to make but the mere scratch of a pen. Surely, the farmer ought to be very thankful for such generous favors! So, the Judge whines and scolds; the cashier "cajoles and flatters:" all for the good of the dear people—the bone and sinew of the nation!

The following quotation, from Simpson's work, we think very appropriate, in finishing this part of the subject:

"Here, then, we behold capital degrading and enslaving mankind; making society vicious, wretched and ferocious, on the one hand—proud, cruel and oppressive, on the other, owing to that tendency in *capital* to *attract*, *extort* and accumulate, from the wages of labor; besides, legalized monopolies grinding down industry to the scanty pittance necessary but to sustain life. And so truly as the sun drinks up the morning dew, so does the *idle capitalist* absorb the just substance of the man of labor,—stripping from his children's limbs what should clothe them—taking from their mouths what should feed them—and keeping from their understandings what should instruct, enlighten, and save them. 'Who's born for sloth?' I answer, the idle capitalist. How many thousands upon thousands live upon the sweat of the poor man's labor, in idle pleasure and *suicidal vice*. Nature decrees it otherwise; justice decrees it otherwise; reason proclaims it ought not to be so;—but *the proud*, *oppressive*, *overbearing*, cruel capitalist, while he admits the fact with *feigned regret*, yet insists that wisdom and virtue are only compatible with *satiety* on the one hand, and *starvation* on the other!"—*Pages* 66–7.

What a pity—what cause of regret, that one who could write such a glowing, living picture of the miseries en-

tailed upon mankind, by the oppressive and unfeeling hand of capital, should so fall from the dignity of manhood, as to prostitute such fine talents as he possessed, for the purpose of inducing the working classes to lend their deliberate aid in establishing and perpetuating one of the greatest and most dangerous "monopolies of capital" perhaps in the world, and which, he well knew, must eventually bring about those very consequences he, apparently, so feelingly deprecates. But, such is the overwhelming influence of capital, that its arrogant claims must be vindicated at all hazards. Justice, religion, and morality, must be sacrificed, that a few may possess all the riches—all the ease—all the comfort—all the enjoyment; and the toiling millions must be kept in hopeless dependence, and, finally, starved to death.

If we have a "National Bank," no one would deny the danger of its existence, if its political views should be antagonistical to those of government; and, on the other hand, if they should happen to be both united against the views of the people, the danger would be still greater;—so that, whether it be the friend or enemy of government, it is alike to be dreaded; nor could real patriotism, under any consideration, tolerate its existence. But if the people will have one, in order to preserve consistency, they ought to abolish all *other* departments of government. This is one of the great questions incumbent on "National Reformers" to settle. They should continually bear in mind, that, when orthodox political economists, stump speakers, or legislators, generally, speak of the *prosperity* of a country, mean the ease, certainty, and rapidity with which *property* passes from the hands of those who produce it into the coffers of *those who produce nothing, but claim the right to own all things.* And the *facilities* to trade and business, mean all those cunning contrivances, invented by the cupidity and avarice of the "*business community*," for the express purpose of producing such results: "satiety on the one hand—starvation on the other."

The working classes may well rejoice that the "monster" pauper-making machine is no more—is "obsolete;" and the small fry may be taken in detail much easier now, than when protected by the gigantic power of the maternal "*monster*."

In addition to all that has been said on this subject, we

would refer the reader to Madison's Journal of the Federa Convention. He will find that it was intended by that body, that the federal government should *not* have the power of making paper money, or of circulating bills of credit. At page 1343, vol. 3, will be found the following record:

"Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved *to strike out* 'and emit bills on the credit of the United States.' If the United States had credit, such bills would be unnecessary; if they had not, unjust and useless. Mr. Butler seconds the motion.

"Mr. Madison. Will it not be sufficient to prohibit the making of them a *tender?* This will remove the temptation to emit them with unjust views. And promissory notes, in that shape, may, in some emergencies, be best.

"Mr. G. Morris. Striking out the words will leave room still for notes of a responsible minister, which will do all the good without the mischief. The moneyed interest will oppose the plan of government, if paper emissions be not prohibited.

"Mr. Gorham was for striking out without inserting any prohibition. If the words stand, they may suggest and lead to the measure.

"Mr. Mason had doubts on the subject. Congress, he thought, would not have the power, unless it were expressed. Though he had a mortal hatred to paper money, yet, as he could not foresee all emergencies, he was unwilling to tie the hands of the Legislature. He observed that the late war could not have been carried on, had such a prohibition existed.

"Mr. Gorham. The power, as far as it will be necessary, or safe, is involved in that of borrowing.

"Mr. Mercer was a friend of paper money, though, in the present state and temper of America, he should neither propose nor approve of such a measure. He was, consequently, opposed to a prohibition of it altogether. It will stamp suspicion on the government, to deny it a discretion on this point. It was impolitic, also, to excite the opposition of all those who were friends to paper money. The people of property would be sure to be on the side of the plan, and it was impolitic to purchase their further attachment with the loss of the opposite class of citizens.

"Mr. Ellsworth thought this a favorable moment to shut and bar the door against paper money. The mischiefs of the various experiments which had been made, were now fresh in the public mind, and had excited the disgust of all the respectable part of America. By withholding the power from the new government, more friends of influence would be gained to it than by almost anything else. Paper money can in no case be necessary. Give the government

credit, and other resources will offer. The power may do harm, *never good.*

"Mr. Randolph, notwithstanding his antipathy to paper money, could not agree to strike out the words, as he could not foresee all the occasions that might arise.

"Mr. Wilson. It will have a most salutary influence on the credit of the United States, to remove the possibility of paper money. This expedient can never succeed while its mischiefs are remembered. And so long as it can be resorted to, it will be a bar to other resources.

"Mr. Butler remarked, that paper was a legal tender in no country in Europe. He was urgent for disarming the government of such a power.

"Mr. Mason was still averse to tying the hands of the *Legislature altogether.* If there was no example in Europe, as just remarked, it might be observed, on the other side, that there was none in which the government was restrained on this head.

"Mr. Read thought the words, if not struck out, would be as alarming as the mark of the Beast in the Revelation.

"Mr. Langdon had rather reject the whole plan than retain the three words, 'and emit bills.'

"On motion for striking out—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, voted aye—9. New Jersey and Maryland, no—2. [So the words were stricken out.]

"The clause for borrowing money was agreed to, *nem. con.*"

The index which refers to the above passage, reads thus:

"Currency. The pretext for one of paper cut off.....1346."

The above vote, if taken individually instead of by States, would have stood thus:—Ayes 30, Noes 7—a majority of over five-sevenths.

From the foregoing evidence, it is perfectly clear that the framers of the Constitution fully intended that no such "*vagrant*" power, as that of circulating bills of credit, or paper money, should exist in the country; consequently, the States are positively prohibited from using it. To prohibit the United States government was not necessary, it having no right to *assume powers* not expressly granted by the States or people: being essentially a government of delegated powers only. The assumption that the General Government can endow others—either individuals or corporations—with powers it does not possess itself, is per-

fectly ridiculous. Such a power has never yet been delegated to the General Government. The 10th Article of Amendments to the Constitution reads thus: "The powers *not* delegated to the States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Will any man, in the face of this evidence, have the hardihood to contend for either the justness or constitutionality of a bank charter? Surely not.

CHAPTER XVI.

A PROTECTIVE TARIFF—PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

There is a very pernicious error prevalent among the American people, the consequences of which ought not to be overlooked by the National Reformer; and that is, in placing too much confidence in the truth of the doctrines, declarations and opinions, advocated by our representatives in our legislative halls, merely because they have the reputation of being great statesmen, or because they belong to this or that political party. Now, this is evidently wrong, and often leads to delusion. For it is notorious to all, that many of our most distinguished and talented statesmen have been on diametrically opposite sides of the various prominent political questions that come before them for discussion at different times. Now, it is *not* possible that either the nature of *truth* or *justice can change;* but the *pursuits and interests of men may, and do:* and are all that can or do change. This view, then, of the subject, dissipates the apparent mystery. We should look upon a representative precisely as we do upon a lawyer going into court for the sole object of defending the cause of his client, be he right or wrong; *such being his sworn duty.*

It is precisely so with a legislator: he goes to fight the battle—advocate and maintain the interests of those that send him: for this is he sent. Neither is it wrong; for when the mass of the people become sufficiently intelligent themselves *to know the right*, with sufficient firmness to demand it, the right will be accomplished—must be; but, till then, cannot be.

At one period of his life, we see an eminent statesman, when representing the pure mercantile interests of the New England States, eloquently discoursing upon the beauty and advantages of free trade and foreign intercourse—of the injustice of giving power to a small portion of community to tax the greater, by legislative means; and, therefore, a high tariff, on the ground or pretext of protection, or for any other purpose than the support of

government, is unjust, and contrary to the genius and spirit of our free institutions; and is, in reality, not protection, but oppression to the great mass of the people.

But, in after years, when the services of this same talented statesman were required, (and finally obtained by a stipend of six thousand dollars per annum, in addition to his eight dollars a day,) for the purpose of pleading the claims of New England capitalists engaged in manufactures, the thing was entirely reversed; all he had said before was now wrong; in short, what was white before, was now black, and *vice versa*.

Now, this is all very simple—very natural; for this he deserves no censure: he did nothing more than any laboring man would do,—work hardest for him that could pay the highest wages. He could now descant upon the duty of government to encourage manufactures—to protect the American mechanic from the fatal effects of the competition of the pauper labor of Europe; that a home market was much better for the farmer than a foreign one; the extra price the farmer would be obliged to pay for his goods, it could be proved, was to his advantage. In short, the whole carrying trade ought to be dispensed with, being injurious to the prosperity of the country; that is, the interest of capitalists engaged in manufactures.

Again, we have seen others, at one time strenuously and with the utmost zeal, opposing the establishment of banks, and other chartered monopolies; being destructive to liberty—a grievous burden imposed upon labor—is the parent of pauperism; tending to reduce the producers of wealth to a state of hopeless misery, dependence and wretchedness. At other times, we find the very same men, with equal zeal, advocating the establishment of the very measures which they had previously declared so pernicious and destructive to the happiness and prosperity of the people. Now, the nature of good and evil—a right and wrong—*never can change*, though *men's pursuits and interests may, and do;* and these are all that can change—principles never can. At this very hour there is scarcely to be found a politician, of any considerable note, that has not been on both sides of some of the various questions that, from time to time, agitate, distract, and bewilder the public mind. These facts are too notorious to need particular mention here; they stare us in the face—they cannot be denied.

This state of things proves, clearly, that a fundamental error exists somewhere; and, also, the absolute necessity of *every man* (if he wishes to avoid the degradation of being the everlasting football of the political demagogue) investigating and understanding the subject of his social and political relation with his fellow men, *for himself*. And let him never forget, that he himself is one of the sovereign people, and is equally entitled to any political *privilege* that any other man is; yet, in a government of equal rights, privileges do not, cannot exist, and are, therefore, an absurdity: officers of government being but the agents or servants of the people, empowered to carry out their will. The great difference between *this* and *other* governments, is, that other governments impose themselves and their laws upon the people without their will or consent, and is a power separate and distinct from the people. But this is not the case with *ours*—the government and the people being, essentially, one and the same; in other words, the people govern themselves. We should be extremely careful that we are not deceived by the mere sound and jingle of words, as many are deluded thereby. Men can always find good names to cover up and hide the ugliness of bad actions. Sometimes they call indirect and oppressive taxation *Protection;* sometimes they call the most outrageous injustice and cruelty by the name of *law and order:* and a manly resistance thereto they call rebellion, treason, disorganization, &c. Yet, these misnomers are not always evidence of dishonesty; because a man *may* be, unconsciously, in error.

The truth of the above remarks are exceedingly well illustrated by Bulwer, in "Paul Clifford;" and, though a fictitious work, "the picture 's true to nature." It will be found in the tenth chapter, as follows:

"'Listen to me, Paul,' answered Augustus; and his reply is not unworthy of notice. 'All crime and all excellence depend upon a good choice of words.—I see you look puzzled; I will explain. If you take money from the public and say you have robbed, you have undoubtedly committed a great crime; but if you do the same and say you have been *relieving the necessities of the poor*, you have done an excellent action: if, in afterward dividing this money with your companions, you say you have been sharing booty, you have committed an offence against the laws of your country. But if you observe, that you have been *sharing with your friends the*

gains of your industry, you have performed one of the noblest actions of humanity. To knock a man on the head is neither virtuous nor guilty, but it depends upon the language applied to the action to make it *murder or glory*. Why not say, then, that you have testified '*the courage of a hero*,' rather than '*the atrocity of the ruffian?*' This is perfectly clear, is it not?'

"'It seems so,' answered Paul.

"'It is so self-evident, it is the way all governments are carried on. If you want to rectify an abuse, those in power call you *disaffected*. *Oppression is 'law and order.' Extortion is 'religious establishment;' and taxes are the 'blessed constitution.'* Therefore, my good Paul, we only do what all other legislators do. We are never rogues so long as we call ourselves honest fellows, and we never commit a crime so long as we can term it a virtue! What say you now?'

"'There is very little doubt but that you are *wrong;* yet if you are, *so are all the rest of the world.* It is of no use to be the only white sheep of the flock. Wherefore, my dear Tomlinson, I will in future be an excellent citizen, *relieve the necessities of the poor, and share the gains of my industry with my friends.*' "

We think the phrase would be much improved, and easier understood, by making it read thus: *Relieve the poor of their incumbrances, and share the gains of my talents among my friends.*

No doubt many would censure Paul for coming to the conclusion he did; but it is precisely the same that the king and all capitalists come to; and the language they make use of, in order to quiet their consciences and stop the mouth of the gainsayer, is: "we promote and accelerate the business and prosperity of the country [that is, themselves,] by the operation!" And it is the same conclusion the *Factory Lord* comes to, when he claims from government the benefit of a protective tariff. But with whom will he share his gains?—with the hard working producer? No, never; but, on the contrary, will rivet on his chains so much the tighter. Keeping these observations in view, we proceed to examine the nature of a

PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

People, in general, when speaking of a tariff, advance the idea, that when a foreign government imposes a duty upon our products, that the payment of that duty is imposed upon us; and that we, the exporters, are obliged to

pay it out of our own pockets; or, in other words, are obliged to deduct so much from the selling price of the article, for the exclusive benefit of the foreign government. Now, this absurdity is too glaring to need a refutation; and we may truly say of it, what Mr. Simpson says of a mixed currency, "*it is a sophism so palpably absurd, as to surprise us at its announcement.*" For, if it were so, nothing could be easier for us to accomplish than to make other nations pay the expenses of our own government: if the thing could be done, there would be some propriety in proposing retaliation; but, as the case really stands, we should only be imposing grievous burdens upon ourselves, of our own free will and accord, merely because other governments usurp, in opposition to the will of their subjects, the power to tyrannize over and oppress them.

Think you, if the people of Great Britain were allowed to speak, they would submit to the injustice of being obliged to pay, continually, at least one hundred per centum more for every mouthful of bread they eat, but for the intervention of government?* They would not submit to the imposition for a moment. Would any body but a fool or madman deliberately hire some one to give him a sound drubbing, rob him, or pick his pocket, merely because others were absolutely compelled to suffer such injustice? Strange kind of retaliation, this!

But, perhaps the worst feature of the protective (or, rather, oppressive) policy, is, that the extra price the consumers pay on protected commodities, does not go to the support of government, but into the pocket of the *capitalist* almost exclusively engaged in the particular business protected; and the real producer or operator is in no way scarcely even benefitted by the policy; and the amount of public revenue is inversely as the extent of protection; that is, the *higher* the tariff, the *less* will be the income to government. C. E. Lester informs us, that, in the year 1840, the consumers of Great Britain paid, on breadstuffs alone, one hundred and fifty million dollars over and above what the same quantity could have been obtained for from other countries, including cost of transportation. And, during the same year, but five million dollars from duties on breadstuffs reached the public treasury, for the use of government!!

* For proof of the fact, see "Condition and Fate of England."

When the advocates of "protection" are driven from the ground first taken, and it is clearly proved that the consumer alone is the duty payer, and that the impost becomes part of the cost—as much so as the wages paid to the operative, or the cost of material—they take shelter behind a still greater absurdity, by admitting that, although we do not pay the foreign imposts upon the goods *exported* by us, yet we do finally pay them on the goods *imported* in return; forgetting that the grand pretext for "*protection*" is, that the importation of foreign goods *works our ruin by their very cheapness!* If this is not blowing hot and cold in the same breath, what is?

Now, the policy of "*protection*" is, in its nature and operation, precisely the same all over the world, and at all times; no matter to whom applied, whether to the *English land lord* or the *American factory lord*, the same results are produced by it. No where in the world has the system of "*protection*" been carried out to such perfection as in Great Britain, and no where in the world shall we find the *land* and the *wealth* of the country monopolized by so few a number of individuals, with a bloated, satiated aristocracy on the one hand; its millions of paupers and famishing operatives on the other. Therefore, the policy ought to be called, not "protection," but unjust oppression.

That the capitalist is benefitted by an oppressive tariff, none will deny; or, rather, is enabled to monopolize more than his equitable share of the wealth of his country, by its means. But at whose expense are his gains? We answer: the great majority of the people who are not protected, a great portion of whom are women and children.

The United States statistics show us, in round numbers, that the whole population of the Union is about seventeen million; and the whole number of persons engaged in manufactures and trades is not quite eight hundred thousand,—which includes both capitalists and operatives. Now, if we allow one out of every five to be a capitalist, it leaves one hundred and sixty thousand persons only that can, or ever were intended to be benefitted or protected by the measure we are now examining. Subtract these capitalists from the whole, and there remains sixteen million eight hundred and forty thousand consumers,—being those who are obliged to pay the tax thus imposed upon the people, which in a year amounts to many million dol-

lars, not one cent of which goes to the support of government, but into the pocket of the capitalist.

Those who contend for a protective tariff, ought to show in what manner the people are benefitted by such a measure; but it cannot be done: in strict propriety, it might be called a *profitable loss to the country.*

Now, we contend that our government has no right to legislate power into the hands of a few to tax the many: it is a gross violation of right. Our opponents have pronounced this conclusive argument a "*humbug*," to be sure; but they have failed to show wherein the humbuggery lies.

As an argument in favor of *profitable taxation*, we are told that, in consequence of the capitalist being enabled to get higher prices for goods, he will pay corresponding wages to the operatives. Now, every body knows that this is not true: he will always get labor as cheap as possible. And when he has succeeded in preventing the importation of foreign manufactures, will he divide his extra gains with his operatives—the very individuals that were to be benefitted and protected? If he is protected to the amount of fifty per cent., will he give the American operative even twenty-five per cent., in wages, more than he would a "foreign pauper operative?" Every one knows he would do no such thing; but, on the contrary, would be more apt to import the foreign pauper operatives himself, so as to bring them in direct competition with the American operatives; while, to prevent such a result, it is pretended an oppressive tariff is needed! And, farther: will not those same factory lords be very apt to use their powerful influence in getting a law passed, in order to keep these pauper operatives of Europe twenty-one years from the ballot-boxes? They would be much more fools than knaves, if they did not.

If we are to foster the "*protective*" policy, let us be consistent. If the American capitalist is to be protected by preventing the importation of *foreign manufactures*, let the American operative be protected to the same extent, by preventing the importation of *foreign pauper labor.* Gentlemen, give us a fair shake: all we ask for is the same kind of sauce for the *goose* as for the *gander.*

Therefore, if the working classes will promote the "protective" system, their first object should be to prevent the importation of foreign "*pauper operatives;*" it will then be

time enough to think about preventing the importation of the goods they make: not till then—it would be perfectly useless.

It has been urged, that experience has proved that goods do not rise in price in consequence of a protective tariff; but, on the contrary, have been known to fall even lower than they had been previously. There is, no doubt, some truth in this, especially if the "*pauper laborers*" of other countries have had time to reach this, and have filled the places that ought to be occupied by *our own countrymen*. Therefore, if a tariff *does not raise* the price of goods, in what way are our own mechanics benefitted or protected by it, either capitalists or operatives? Why, the very pretext for its existence at once vanishes; the very strongest argument in its favor goes by the board.

It is true, that goods frequently do become cheaper, after the imposition of a tariff, than they were before; but this fact only proves that goods will get cheaper, even in spite of a tariff. A contraction of bank issues will cheapen property—so will improvements in labor-saving machinery—so will new facilities to intercourse, as cheaper means of transportation,—and *so will competition among the working classes*. It would be surprising, indeed, if, by a combination of the above causes, or only a part of them, they should not have the effect, sometimes, to make things so much cheaper, that it would overbalance the effect of the tariff altogether. And, as we have said before, if a tariff does *not enhance* or raise the price of goods, then the principal argument in its favor utterly fails.

Competition, improvements in the arts and sciences, all kinds of machinery, railroads, steam navigation, &c., in their operation, have a direct tendency to make the products of labor cheap, by lessening not only the cost of production, but also that of transportation; and it is for this very reason we contend that the prosperity of a community is promoted, to wit: by making commodities cheap; cheapness always indicating *abundance*, and, on the contrary, dearness always indicating *scarcity*. Therefore, if it be *good and right* to make things *cheap*, it must be *evil and wrong* to make them *dear:* that is certain.

Now, is it not a gross absurdity, that while nineteen-twentieths of the people are devoting all their energies and faculties to the process of making things cheap, the

other twentieth should be endowed, by a special act of government, with the power to counteract their beneficial operation,—make things cheap with twenty hands, and dear with one? It would puzzle even Solomon, with all his wisdom, to show how the people, *en masse*, are benefitted, when the privileged capitalist is the only individual who reaps a princely harvest by the operation, and all the rest are losers.

Some twenty or thirty years since, wooden clocks were invented in a sister State, and were offered for sale, in all parts of the Union, at much cheaper rates than other clocks could possibly be made for. The brass clock makers took the alarm; they perceived, at once, that if this business continued, their own would shortly be broken up, and themselves completely thrown out of employment. They perceived, also, the impossibility of procuring aid or "*protection*" from government. O, no, it is only *our own countrymen* that can be permitted to "*break down our manufactures*," and ruin us by making the products of labor too cheap. Foreigners must not do this. So the only thing these poor clock-makers could do, to prevent the destruction of their business, was to endeavor to destroy the reputation of wooden clocks, and refuse to repair them—thereby discouraging the public from purchasing. But all this did not cure "*the evil.*" Clocks were supplied in still greater abundance, and at less and less prices, till the country became flooded by them; and now the consequence is, that thousands of families can have several clocks now, where one could not own one before. And now, candid reader, was this result beneficial or injurious to the community? And if this result was beneficial to the people,—which is, evidently, the case,—would it have been any *less so* had it been brought about by foreigners, instead of our own countrymen? Surely not.

In addition, then, to all the other absurdities involved in a protective tariff, we have this, namely: our own countrymen may injure us with impunity, but *foreigners shall not be allowed to do us good.*

These observations and arguments will apply with equal force to all other products of labor.

Let legal money value in the elements of nature be abolished, and the public lands made free to actual settlers; give us good money—gold and silver,—nothing else

is money; give us no special privileges, and the American people need no other protection.

The American capitalist has many advantages over the European, with which he ought to be satisfied: he might pay much higher wages, and make greater profits than the foreign capitalist; because,

First. The interest of the British Funded Debt amounts to three hundred million dollars, which must be paid annually: the capitalist must pay his portion.

Second. Cheaper land.

Third. Cheaper provisions.

Fourth. The absence of a king and a hereditary nobility

With all these advantages he is not satisfied,—not ever when government has given him, by act of special legislation, in addition, thirty per cent. And yet these cormorants are not satisfied; the everlasting cry is, "give us more—give us more!"

Of all the contrivances invented by the cupidity of the gormandizing capitalist, for the purpose of relieving the poor man of the fruits of his toil, none appears so plausible, upon its mere surface, as a "*protective tariff*;" yet it works the same results as all the others: it concentrates the wealth of the country into the hands of a few, producing over-abundance and satiety, on the one hand—poverty, wretchedness and degradation, on the other; and, in the language of the cold-hearted, short-sighted capitalist, "*promotes the prosperity of the country*."

Now, fellow working men,—you that make all the wealth of the world,—remember these things when you go to the ballot-boxes—give your vote for "*a free soil and an inalienable homestead*."

After recapitulating the subject, we find that the following absurdities are involved in a "*protective tariff*:"

First. It gives power to the few, who are the rich, to tax the many, who are poor.

Second. It causes things to cost more labor or money than is necessary to produce them.

Third. It is injuring ourselves willingly, because others are injured forcibly, on the ground of retaliation.

Fourth. It decreases the revenue of a country.

Fifth. It produces a profitable loss to the country.

Sixth. It prevents foreigners from doing us good, while our own countrymen are allowed to injure us.

Seventh. It makes the products of labor dear, while the combined energies of the people are engaged in making them cheap.

In lieu of the above bundle of absurdities, the following is proposed as the only just principle of

AMERICAN PROTECTION:

A free soil for a free people, and an inalienable homestead *for all*. Producers of wealth, let these be your watchwords; and thus head your tickets at the *ballot-boxes*.

CHAPTER XVII.

REBELLION.

"Rebellion! thou demon of darkness!
Avaunt! stand back! hie to thy fitting abode
Beneath the blood-stained throne, where thou belongest.
In a land where rights are equal, thou hast
No calling.
Thou wouldst quickly starve to death.
There is no blood for thee to feed upon;
* * * * * Therefore, begone!"

WILL men rebel against a government that protects them in their rights, promotes their happiness, and does them justice? Never. Neither can the people rebel against themselves.

The following beautiful *morceau* not long since appeared in many of our public prints, without a comment, and written by an American for the edification of a people professing to recognize the principles of equal rights. We shall review it as we pass along. Here it is:

"THE PLAGUE OF HOUSEKEEPERS.

"'Help,' as English Trollopes say we call all domestic servants, is a sore source of trouble to housekeepers throughout the free States.

"Major Noah, in his last 'Messenger,' has one of his characteristic editorials on this subject. Says he:

"We have found out the secret why servants plague the mistress of the house almost to death, and why a first rate waiting girl in England makes a most indifferent servant in America, viz: the freedom of our institutions, which not only applies to all callings and occupations, but are assumed by all; and all become infected with liberty and equality the moment they touch our soil. The 'largest liberty' was not understood by our revolutionary fathers to extend beyond political rights, and was not remotely intended to break down the barriers of society. In England, a man will hire a groom at a smaller salary, if you give him a handsome livery; in this

country, you must increase your wages, if you wish your groom to wear livery at all. This doctrine was exemplified recently in a family advertising for a woman who could make herself generally useful; and among a number of applicants was an exceedingly prepossessing looking girl, neatly dressed, with a handsome, open countenance and ruddy complexion—a taking face, as we may call it. The lady said—

"'You are an English girl, I believe?'

"'Yes, ma'am—just arrived. Only been in the city two days; have no acquaintance at all, and only wish to go to church Sunday afternoons.'

"'You have a recommendation, I suppose?'

"'Yes, ma'am—a seven years' character, and a recommendation from our minister.'

"The documents being read, and all found genuine and satisfactory, the lady asked what wages she would expect.

"'Why, ma'am, the stewardess on board ship told me to ask seven dollars a month. I had in London nine pounds a year.'

"'Why, that is scarcely four dollars a month. Now I am willing to give six dollars, provided you would suit me. Having lived so long in one place, you can remember what kind of work was required of you?'

"'Oh, yes, ma'am, I was maid of all work.'

"'Indeed! Let me hear what was required of you.'"

Then follows a long string of duties enumerated by the girl, not necessary to insert here; after which the lady asks—

"'And did you get through with all this work?'

"'All, ma'am.'

"'Well, if you do but half as much for me, I shall be satisfied. You can come to-morrow.'

"At the end of a month, we asked the lady after her 'maid of all work.'

"'Oh, she went away in a fortnight—said this was a free country, and she could not work herself to death.'"

Then follows the remarks of the editor of the Cincinnati Chronicle, in the following words:

"This is the history of all servants. They arrive here with every required qualification—courteous, willing and valuable; but they soon become corrupted by example, and are taught rebellion by their associates, and liberty and equality by their colleagues of the kitchen and pantry. There are but few families in this country

who keep a girl two or three years; whereas, in England, ten years is no uncommon period for a servant to remain in one place. We know of no remedy to correct the evil."

We have shown, in this work, that the aristocracy of the civilized world have concocted and put into operation a plan or system, by means of which the rich can keep their poor brethren in perpetual bondage, poverty and misery, and finally starve them to death; and all this in accordance with religion, morality and virtue. But if the poor do but *speak* of liberty, or of equal rights, it is rebellion and treason! Producers of wealth, do you understand this? If you do not, it is high time for you to look into the matter.

Is it so, that those who starve their fellow men to death, are good and virtuous, and those that contend for equal rights, are rebels and traitors? Does religion and morality teach this? Surely not. Is it a virtue for the rich to rob the poor, and a crime for the poor to rob the rich?

Now for the Major—the great Major Noah. He says that all foreigners become "infected with liberty and equality, the moment they touch our soil." Oh, horrible! what a loathsome disease to catch; and people of all callings and occupations catch it! How sinful, how criminal, to be infected with the ideas of liberty and equality! Did not the Major imbibe the infection himself? It is in extreme bad taste for the Major to be so selfish. Again, the gentleman says: "In England, a man will hire a groom at a smaller salary, if you give him a handsome livery; in this country, you must increase his wages, if you wish your groom to wear livery at all." Well, is it in any way surprising that a man should want to be pretty well paid for deliberately putting on a badge of servitude and degradation? Not at all. He ought to insist on at least a thousand dollars a year, for submitting to the indignity. The Major himself, we think, would not do it for that sum, nor for all Grand Island to boot.

"We know of no remedy to correct these evils," says the editor of the Chronicle. Let the gentleman learn to respect the rights and feelings of his fellow human beings; let him consider, that, although some may be servants, they are still human beings, capable of suffering pain and of enjoying pleasure like himself; that we are all children of one common parent, having, naturally, the same rights

and responsibilities. It therefore behooveth him, as a good christian, to treat his servants kindly, and unto the fatherless be a father; never forgetting that servants, as well as others, will remain longest with those who use them best.

That celebrated christian moral philosopher, the Rev Dr. Paley, in his "Moral Philosophy," says:

"Our obligations to our servants are much greater than theirs are to us. It is a mistake to suppose that the rich man maintains his tradesmen, servants, tenants and laborers; the truth is, *they maintain him.* It is their industry which supplies his table, furnishes his wardrobe, builds his houses, adorns his equipage, and provides his amusements. It is not the estate, but the labor employed upon it, that pays his rent. All that he does is to distribute [and consume] what others produce."

Here, then, is authority which ought not to be despised nor rejected; and may the gentleman learn wisdom from the lesson: do unto others as he would that others should do unto him.

In the Cincinnati Chronicle of October 14th, 1845, will be found an account of the World's Convention, held in New York in the same year, from which we will make a few extracts for the edification of National Reformers and the working classes generally. The modest editor thus remarks:

"The World's Convention! what a sonorous name! One would think the mountains would bow their heads to listen, and the little streams run mad to meet them. Well, what do you think the World's Convention is? About one hundred and fifty persons, with Robert Owen at their head, every man of whom might fairly be mistaken for escaped madmen. [How amiable, how charitable, how profound!] Now we *notice* them in order to give our readers an [erroneous] idea of what sort of people they are, and what sort of reformation they propose to mankind. Take the following from the proceedings:

"'Mr. Evans, of the National Reformers and Anti-Renters, after stating divers principles, the *gist* of his statement was in the following items:

"'18. Constitutions and laws are binding only when in accordance with natural rights. [Just so thought the heroes of 1776.]

"'19. The master-evil, in all nations called civilized the main cause of poverty and its consequences, ignorance, misery and crime, the sole cause of slavery of every grade, is the monopoly of the

soil; and the leading measure of practical reform, in all these countries, is a restoration of the land to the people by political action, or, in failure of that, by revolution.

"'20. The United States of North America are most favorably circumstanced for a restoration of the soil; and the most practical measures for this purpose are, first, to limit the quantity of land to be hereafter acquired by individuals or associations; and second, to prevent all further traffic in land by the government, and to make the public lands free, on the principle proposed by the National Reform Association and its Auxiliaries throughout the United States.'"

The editor then says:

"These principles might be stated in a briefer form, thus:

"1. Laws are never binding when a savage chooses to break them. [Instance, the savage heroes of 1776.]

"2. The *leading measure of reform* is to commence by a WHOLESALE ROBBERY of every man who owns lands."

Now, candid reader, is there a sentiment anything like this, even by the utmost stretch of implication, in the article quoted by himself, and of which the above is his travesty? But the strangest part of the business is, that this editor wishes to be considered a man of truth and veracity. Rather a curious way he has of making such an impression upon the minds of his readers. The language he himself makes use of in regard to the persons composing the World's Convention, is extremely applicable to himself. This very editor "might fairly be taken for an escaped madman." "We thus notice" him, "in order to give our readers" a correct "idea of what sort of" a gentleman he is. The 'gentleman' goes on with his travesty, thus:

"The United States of North America are very favorably circumstanced for the commencement of this wholesale robbery.

"These are certainly plain and frank propositions. [But the travesty a shameful misrepresentation.] This society of thieves could not have stated them plainer, and, it is probable, would not have been more honest."

Such, then, is a sample of the honest integrity of an editor of a public paper, and such his lessons of moral teaching. "The utmost charity that can be extended to" such teachers, "is, that they are greater blockheads than

they are knaves. The utmost sympathy which they can demand, is, that they should be placed under the curative treatment of disordered minds."

And so it is: those self-styled friends of law and order may rob the poor, the ignorant, the weak and defenceless, of the elements of nature, and of the fruits of their labor and toil—reduce them to beggary, and, finally, starve them to death, and yet be patterns of piety, lovers of justice, and entitled to honor and respect;—while, if the poor—their oppressed and plundered victims—do but endeavor to devise a plan for the purpose of effecting a restoration of their long-lost rights to a free use of the elements, and the ownership of the fruits of their own labor, they are stigmatized as villains, traitors, rebels, thieves and robbers. Those self-styled friends of law and order may rest assured that their days are numbered; the end of their power and influence is at hand; they must shortly mend their ways, or give place to other and better men; themselves pass to the shades of oblivion, and be numbered with the things that were.

Producers of wealth, it is for you to decide who are the greatest thieves and robbers: those who have deprived you of God's elements, and stripped you of the fruits of your industry, thereby making you beggars and paupers, or *you* who suffer the injustice. How long will you suffer yourselves to be cajoled and flattered by the cant and hypocrisy of your money-serving, false moral teachers? Do you not know that if a man is stolen from his land, he becomes a slave? and if the land is stolen from the man, he becomes equally one? Do you not know, that you have the same right to the free use of the soil as you have to breathe the atmosphere, or enjoy the light and heat from the sun? Whoever has the right to make merchandise of the earth, has an equal right to buy and sell your body; and, without the free use of the soil, no man can possibly exist a freeman. Come, then, producers of wealth—wake up, organize your forces, march boldly up to the ballot-boxes, and strike the mighty blow: make the public lands free, and every man's homestead inalienable, and half your work of reform is done.

We conclude this chapter with a quotation from the Cincinnati Chronicle, as before mentioned; first premising that many good men think that the editor stands about as pro-

minent in the world as he considers "The World's Convention" did. At the commencement of his article, he says:

"Small [men or] things in this globe sometimes make as much noise as great ones, as every one knows who has had a gnat about his head in a summer night. It is not what these little ones *do*, so much as what they *say*, that is annoying or troublesome. Pat, an Irishman, was one night abusing the musquitoes. Some one said he was surprised that he should care so much about a musquito bite. 'Faith,' says Pat, 'an' it isn't I that cares about the bite, if they didn't brag so much.' So it is with the modern as well as the ancient pretenders to superior wisdom [*and moral excellence.*] They never *do* anything [*good,*] but they *brag* so loud that we are obliged to hear them."

Producers of wealth, let those little fellows bite and brag on. Heed them not. Let them brand you as "rebels, traitors, thieves and robbers;" it is nothing but what you may expect. It is consoling to reflect, however, that their little venomous bills are being extracted by the dexterous hand of Truth, and, ere long, will become as harmless as young lambs or sucking doves. Let them have their way, —they can do us no harm nor themselves any good, by the methods they have adopted to prevent the progress of "National Reform."

To be sure, those little fellows—the guardians of public morals—do not always write nonsense. As an instance, the very best advice, and the proper course for "National Reformers" to pursue, is correctly laid down in a number of the very paper which stigmatizes them as "thieves and robbers." It is as follows:

"*Perform fearlessly what you believe to be right.* Never mind the opposition made by your enemies: they cannot har you. The thrusts of those who hate or envy you, will never hurt you if you are faithful to your duty. Let truth, justice and integrity, be on your side, and you may resist a host: with these, one may chase a thousand, and two can put ten thousand to flight."

In this chapter it has been clearly shown, that for the poor to endeavor to devise a plan by which they may obtain justice, is treason and rebellion!—but when the rich devise a plan to starve the poor to death, it accords with religion and morality!

CHAPTER XVIII.

HOUSE RENT.

Very few persons indeed are aware of the unjust and oppressive nature of house rent. If you buy a coat, a hat or a pair of shoes, you pay for them but once; you have the pleasure of wearing them out or of disposing of them, at all times, as you please. Not so with a house. Suppose you engage a hatter to make you a hat to cost six dollars, and which would last you one year. Suppose, further, if, on going for your hat, you could not pay the whole amount down, and the hatter should offer to "accommodate" you with the use of the hat, on the following conditions, viz: to pay him twenty-five cents per week, or one dollar per month, for the use of the hat, and at the end of the year return it to him, be it good or bad. You would, no doubt, think it a very strange kind of proposition. But it is not half so extravagant as the conditions imposed by a landlord upon his tenants. At twenty-five cents per week, the hat would amount to thirteen dollars; at fifty cents per month, only twelve dollars: double the cost price of the hat. But, in the case of a house, the discrepancy between the cost price of the thing, and the amount actually paid for the use of it, is much greater.

Many houses rent for five hundred dollars a year, that have not cost more than two thousand five hundred dollars. All are aware of this. Now, about two per cent. on the original cost will keep a well-built house in good repair at least sixty years, and, at the end of that time, will still be a house having some value; and, in a good business place, if sold, would bring twice, perhaps three times the amount of money it cost, originally, to build it. Five hundred dollars a year, in sixty years, will amount to thirty thousand. And this sum will build twelve houses equally as good as the one that thirty thousand dollars has been paid for the use of! You see this is six times more extravagant than the case of the hat—the hatter getting but two hats for the use of one, while the landlord gets

twelve houses for the use of one. There must be some great error somewhere, or such results could not be effected. The thing is too glaringly absurd; because nothing—neither a hat, nor a house, nor a dollar—can ever be worth more than itself. The just rent for the use of anything, is an equivalent for whatever portion is used or consumed by him that uses it—no more. Anything demanded beyond this, is tyranny, oppression, cannibalism. And if the laws making legal value in the elements were abolished, and all men were alike free to compete with each other on perfectly equal grounds, such instances of injustice and tyranny (keeping the aggregate in view,) could never be effected; because, the elements being equally free to the use of all, no man would submit to the imposition. At least one-half of the money paid in the form of house rent, is predicated on the money value of the land; which might as well be predicated upon the atmosphere, or the rays of the sun. Abolish, therefore, the legal money value of the elements, and one-half the tyranny and oppression of the world will at once cease.

We do affirm, and that, too, without fear of refutation, that the grand source of all the evils of which the producers of wealth have any just cause of complaint, arises chiefly from the practice of governments in confounding the elements of Nature with the products of human labor, and by legalizing traffic in the elements alone, especially in land and human flesh. It is the immediate cause of Slavery in all its forms, and has filled the world with crime and confusion. Furthermore, we affirm that the capital of the world never could have been accumulated into the few hands it is, but by the mighty power and influence of LAND MONOPOLY. This is the grand lever by which it has been accomplished. Let the removal of this bane of human happiness, be the first object to engage the attention of "National Reformers," in their march of progress, and millions yet unborn will have abundant cause to rejoice in their victory

THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.

It appears by the "Temperance Papers," that a movement is being made among the friends of Temperance, to combine their influence to procure the passage of a law making the sale of ardent spirits *criminal*, on the ground of its being *destructive to human life and happiness*. We are not in the least disposed to controvert the position assumed by those gentlemen, and not doubting but that the desire to do it arises from the purest feelings of humanity, philanthropy and benevolence. But have they duly considered to what the introduction of such a principle would lead? They surely would not stop at that point, but would be consistent, and go on. All those who have examined the subject, are convinced that where the use of ardent spirits destroys the happiness and life of one human being, *Land Monopoly* destroys thousands. And at this moment the "*Land Gods*" of Europe are starving the people to death by millions. And, therefore, if it be criminal to buy and sell ardent spirits, to buy and sell *land* must be a thousand times more so. Now, if the gentlemen above alluded to intend to carry out the proposed measure, let them be consistent—make it criminal to sell land, as well as ardent spirits, and not "*strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.*"

There is another point which is worthy of consideration about this matter, and is a fact that cannot be denied, that a great portion of those who ruin themselves and families by the use of ardent spirits—perhaps nine out of every ten—are directly or indirectly driven or tempted into the practice by the influence of "Land Monopoly," by allowing some to spend their time in idle uselessness, and are thereby tempted to dissipation, Satan always finding mischief for idle hands to do; while many others are driven to the bottle by a keen sensibility of their hard and toilsome lot, and destitute condition, brought upon them by the stony heart and iron hand of pauper-making "*Land Monopoly.*"

Let us all, therefore, reflect deeply upon these things, and if we come to the conclusion that there is wisdom in making it criminal to sell ardent spirits, there will be much more wisdom in making it criminal to sell land; which all men have the same right to use, that they have the atmosphere, without money and without price

CHAPTER XIX.

"EQUITABLE COMMERCE."

A WORK bearing the above title, published by Josiah Warren, New Harmony, Indiana, has lately appeared before the public. The work professes to be, "A new development of principles for the harmonious adjustment and regulation of the pecuniary, intellectual and moral intercourse of mankind, proposed as elements of new society." The author of this work, and myself, appear to have the same object in view, namely, to show the means by which the producers of wealth may secure to themselves the free use of the elements, and the products of their own labor, or their equivalents. I feel it, therefore, a duty I owe to my fellow men, to take some notice of his work.

If Mr. Warren has solved the *whole* problem of man's moral, social, and political relations, then my remarks will be supererogatory. But if he has not, and I should be so fortunate as to throw some light upon the subject, I shall consider myself as amply rewarded by the reflection, that my humble efforts have not been exercised in vain. I disclaim all desire or intention of injuring Mr. Warren, my only object being a development of truth; and of this, surely, the gentleman will not complain, especially when he considers that we are both engaged in the same righteous cause. He must, therefore, consider me not as an enemy, but as a friendly co-worker. Let all persons read both sides; then judge for themselves, as I am perfectly willing these observations may go for what they are worth: truth, being stronger than error, will, therefore, prevail.

I cheerfully indorse all that Mr. Warren has said in regard to governments having utterly failed to accomplish the end they have pretended to have had in view, namely, the security of person and property—the history of governments in general being but the history of the legal methods of committing the most glaring outrages and violations of right and justice. Money, also, in consequence

of being accumulated in the hands of the few, has been converted into a terrible engine of tyranny and oppression. This, no one will deny. In order to cast off the shackles imposed upon us by the means of government and money, Mr. Warren proposes to reject and disregard both, which is as impossible to do, as it is to refuse to breathe the atmosphere which surrounds us. Nothing would please dishonest law-makers and public rulers better, than for the honest producers to become disgusted with the use of the ballot-box, and permit their lordships to do all the voting. This is the very thing they want; and, to prove this, let the reader turn to Judge Hall's address, page 51 of this work.* But for the producers to do this, would be as injudicious as would a shepherd who should draw off his sturdy watch dogs from guarding his flock of sheep, when he knew, at the same time, that a gang of hungry wolves were watching for a favorable moment to fall upon and destroy them. No, no, producers of wealth; in the ballot-box lies your only hope. To attempt to step aside from the influence of government, would be as inconsistent as an individual who, having in his house a set of lawless rowdies, tearing and breaking his property to pieces, should say to them,—Gentlemen, I insist on individual sovereignty, and therefore have the sole right to control my own person and property, and will not submit to your injustice;—*then creep under the bed*, leaving the rowdies a clear board.

Shall we reject the use of money, because governments and a crafty few have used it for evil purposes? This is a strange conclusion to come to, surely. With the same propriety we might reject almost everything that is calculated to promote the happiness of man. For what infamous purposes have governments and the crafty few made use of iron, in the form of warlike implements; by the use of which, men have been set to butcher each other by thousands upon thousands, and the earth made to flow in rivers of blood? yet this is no reason why we should reject the use of it.

Gold and silver, like all other substances, are capable of being used for good or for evil; and, so soon as the mass of the people understand the real nature of them, they will be used for good, and the happiness and well-being of mankind will be promoted by the use of them; but so long

* Working Man's Political Economy.

as the mass are ignorant of the subject, gold and silver will be made use of by the crafty few, as an engine of extortion, tyranny and oppression. Mr. Warren says, page 37:

"As we cannot carry flour, shoes, carpentering, brick-work, store-keeping, &c., about with us, to exchange for what we want, we require something which *represents* these, which representative we can always carry with us. This *representative of property* should be our circulating medium. Theorists have said that money was this representative, but it is *not*."

Demagogues have told us that it is; but not those who understand the subject. Further, he says:

"A dollar represents nothing whatever but itself, nor can it be made to. At no time is it any demand on any one for any quantity of any kind of property or labor whatever."

Suppose that, instead of using the word dollar, we say one ounce of silver, we shall understand the subject better; then, if one ounce of silver is at no time a demand on any one for property or labor, neither is a bushel of wheat. But if a bushel of wheat is a demand for as much labor as it costs to produce it, then is an ounce of silver a demand for as much labor as it costs to produce *it*, both, on an average, being of about the same commercial value. An ounce of silver is the embodiment of the quantity of labor necessary to produce it, like the wheat in that respect; but the silver, being much less weighty, much less bulky, and will last much longer, is, therefore, much more convenient to carry with us, instead of "flour, shoes, carpentering, brick-work, store-keeping, &c.," to exchange for other products of labor. An ounce of silver is positive payment; it is not necessary to inquire who is the issuer of it, where does he live, what is his character, state of his health, &c., which would be the case when we receive a "*labor note*." Neither is it necessary to stamp upon it—"*Not transferable*." Again Mr. Warren says:

"At one time a dollar [or an ounce of silver] will procure two bushels of potatoes; at another time, three bushels; at another time, four. It has no definite value at any time."

The same can be said of a bushel of wheat; it will

generally purchase from three to four bushels of potatoes, without the intervention of money; yet I have seen the time when a bushel of wheat, or three of Indian corn, would not purchase one bushel of potatoes; yet the farmer who raised and sold the potatoes at this high price, was not so well paid for his labor as when he got but one-fourth of the price, or, in other words, one-fourth the quantity of other products of labor. Therefore, (according to Mr. Warren's philosophy,) a bushel of wheat "*represents nothing whatever but itself; nor can it be made to. At no time is it any demand on any one for any quantity of any kind of property or labor whatever.*" But the true philosophy in regard to this matter is this: A bushel of wheat is the embodiment of the quantity of labor necessary to produce it, and it is precisely the same thing in respect to an ounce of silver, or a dollar. Either of them, therefore, is positive payment for something that has cost the same amount of labor; not a promise, obligation, nor representative; but bona fide property, each in its peculiar form, and are justly equivalent in exchange for the same amount of property in any other form. The idea that money is only a representative of property, is, therefore, a delusion, and works more mischief and confusion in the affairs of mankind, perhaps, than any other error. The fluctuations in the commercial value of the various products of labor, arise from various causes, and which mostly exist in the nature of things, and although may be considerably counteracted by intelligence, prudence and foresight, cannot, perhaps, by human wisdom, be entirely removed.

Those products of labor which are most liable to rot, or destruction, are, in direct proportion, subject to fluctuation, in all cases where the demand has been either over or under supplied; and this consequence cannot be prevented, whether we estimate those products immediately by the quantity of labor embodied in them, or remotely by money, which retains, without loss, to a much greater length of time, the original quantity of labor bestowed upon its production, *than any other thing*.

Gold and silver having the natural property of retaining the quantity of labor originally invested in them much longer than property in any other form, is one of the principal reasons why they are a more appropriate circulating medium *than any other thing*, notwithstanding what Mr.

Warren says to the contrary. Neither does money "represent robbery, banking, gambling, swindling, counterfeiting, &c.," as he says, than does "a labor note," which is a thing that bears the suspicion of fraud upon the very face of it, and is, in itself, a perfect absurdity. *A circulating medium not transferable!!* This is just like the wagon a man made "*for to go*," and it would have went "*for to go*," if the maker of it had not nailed all the wheels fast to the axle trees. Mr. Warren seems not to be aware that all the products of labor derive their exchangable value from the quantity of labor required to produce them —gold and silver included—and that the natural tendency of exchangable value (or price) is to gravitate toward *the cost of production;* and men never would have conducted their exchanges on any other principle than equal amounts of cost. If governments had not made private property in the elements legal, nor had interfered with the personal operations of individuals, the mere instincts of Nature would have prevented it. All this I have fully demonstrated, as I am confident, in the seventh chapter of this work, to which I refer Mr. Warren, hoping he will read it carefully and critically; and if the principles there laid down are not agreeable to truth, it is a duty he owes to the public, and a compliment due to myself, for him to expose and make manifest the errors and fallacies thereof.

At page 76 of his work, he gives "*a picture*" of a "*Labor Note*," the first line of which reads thus: "*Not transferable*"; next, the following mottoes: "Cost, the limit of Price," "*Labor for Labor*." Now, this is only saying the same thing twice over; but is, nevertheless, the announcement of a great and important truth; and, as I have said before, if governments had not usurped the ownership of the elements, thereby checking the natural operation of free competition, mankind never could have conducted their exchanges on any other principle,—it is the natural, therefore the just, no matter whether they had used money or not. History informs us, that the original intent of stamping money was merely to indicate the quantity (by weight) and the fineness of the metal composing the pieces, the object being merely to save the time and labor necessary to weigh and assay it every time it changed hands.

Next on the note, these words appear, namely:

"Due the bearer, ———, one hour's labor in house rent, or twenty pounds of corn."

In regard to this note, Mr. Warren remarks—

"This addition to the note enables us not only to compare one labor with another, but it gives the signer of it an alternative, in case it is not convenient for him to give his labor on demand There can be as many of these alternatives (all being equal in value,) as the responsible person chooses to attach to his note."

Now, the whole announcement amounts to nothing more than this,—that if one man owes another a debt, and it is not convenient to pay in his own services, he can pay in something else of equal value; that is, if the creditor is willing to receive it. All these things were well known long before the invention of "labor notes"; but is it not strange that the gentleman would exclude from the "*alternatives*" gold and silver? Surely it is; especially when we consider that gold or silver is the almost everlasting embodiment of the labor necessary to produce it, and is positive payment, while a "Labor Note" is payment for nothing; it is but a promise to pay, at some future time, if the drawer happened to live long enough, never got sick, and was perfectly honest. Truly, the ingenuity and refinement of this credit system beats the banking system all hollow; a bank note at least being transferable, though, like the "labor note," it is payment *for nothing;* and the making of *it* a substitute for gold and silver, as a circulating medium, is one of the most outrageous violations of right and justice that has ever been imposed upon poor credulous man. Mr. Warren says, "we want a circulating medium that is a definite representative of a definite quantity of property." Further, he tells us that the drawer of a "labor note" may insert in it any alternative he chooses (provided they are equivalents.) Now, suppose he should insert in it, "at one time, a man; at another, a monkey; then a gourd"; then say of it, "a picture that would represent" such things, "would be just as legitimate and fit for a portrait, as a "labor note" is fit for a "circulating medium." This is what Mr. Warren says of "*common money*"; but the logic of the argument is much more applicable to a labor promissory note, than that

money which contains within itself, everlastingly embodied, the quantity of labor originally invested in it, and is bona fide payment. A circulating medium having the last mentioned property, is much preferable to any representative whatever. Mr. Warren proposes that labor notes be put in competition with *money*, and thinks that they will finally supersede the use of it.

This will take place when people discover that the promise of a thing which is dependent upon various contingencies, is preferable to the positive possession of it, and I am confident the skulls of the people are too thick to be susceptible of imbibing such a transcendental idea—it is so far above the comprehension of common minds. So the possessors of "filthy lucre" need not be alarmed at the sight of a "labor note," the mass being too stupid to take advantage of its own wonderful power and influence.

Mr. Warren says, page 73, that when the system of Equitable Commerce, which he advocates, is put into operation, such a power will be started into existence, which will be perfectly irresistible, and that all the deep-laid plans, the wordy warfare, and the bitterest hostility of the strongest opposers of reformation, "*must become as chaff before the wind*," &c. Again, same page,—

"No one *can* sell house lots for five thousand dollars, while any one will sell them of equal *value* for five dollars."

"No one *can* sell coffee for sixteen cents a pound, where any one will sell it equally good for ten cents."

"No one *can* get five dollars per hour for visiting the sick, when another, whose services are equally valuable, can be obtained for an equivalent."

"No lawyer *can* get a hundred dollars per hour, when another will do the business as well for an equal amount of labor."

Here are four declarations, the truth of which no rational person would attempt to dispute,—they are all in accordance with the laws which govern our nature. But there is another side to this subject; and here follows four other declarations, which are equally true, and are equally in accordance with the laws which govern human nature.

First. No one *will* sell house-lots for five dollars apiece, when he can just as easily get five thousand for the same.

Second. No one *will* sell coffee for ten cents a pound, when he can just as easily get sixteen for the same.

Third. No one *will* take one equivalent for an hour's service, when he can just as easily get from a hundred to a thousand for the same amount of service.

Fourth. No lawyer *will* take an equal amount of labor in exchange for his own services, when he could just as easily obtain five hundred times that amount! He would be an idiot if he did, and so would all the rest.

Now, is it possible that a sane individual would seriously make such a strange proposition to mankind? The proposition lies before me, in the book. But stranger still are the inducements held out to draw people into the adoption of these arrangements.

We are gravely told that "any number, of any profession, (which is likely to be wanted,) can be qualified in from two to three years." And what is the reward offered for this two or three years' expensive devotion to intense study, loss of time, &c.? He shall have *the privilege of receiving one five-hundredth part of the reward he could get outside this enchanted circle.* Will men thus make martyrs of themselves? Experience says no, most emphatically.

Where, then, is that great army of martyrs to come from, that can accomplish the result contemplated by Mr. Warren? The rich can never have a motive to embrace these arrangements; the poor may; but where is the necessary capital to come from? "Labor notes" are not capital. Capital is labor already performed, and condensed into some permanent form. But a labor note is but a promise to perform some labor at some future time, dependent on various contingencies, and, therefore, can neither do the offices, nor enter into competition with capital, no more than can common promissory notes payable in money.

Let the reader now turn back and examine those four pair of declarations, which are all true; look at the *cans* and the *wills* in deadly array against each other; examine them carefully and critically, and tell us, if he can, by what means those discordant elements can be amalgamated and formed into a system that will carry on the commercial concerns of mankind successfully and harmoniously, and, at the same time, shield and protect the down-trodden producer from the overwhelming and oppressive influence of money and governments, even supposing it to be only

among a select few, determined to step aside from general society, and agree to put in practice the labor for labor principle.

We shall, perhaps, be told that such a result can be accomplished by the intervention of "labor notes." Let us suppose a select few gather themselves within a certain circle, but surrounded outside by the worshippers of "filthy lucre." Let them issue their labor notes; what will be the consequence, premising, however, that no one is pledged or obligated to act, in any particular manner, different from what their interests would prompt them, all being "*independent sovereigns*"? Now, will not these sovereigns act like other men? Surely they will. Now, suppose one of them has a wife or child taken sick, and must have a nurse, and one is not to be had within the pale, he will, therefore, be obliged to get one from among the Philistines. All within the pale having a sovereign contempt for the use of money, it is not likely any money could be had to pay the nurse with, when through with her job. Now, how does he pay her? with a labor note, promising to give as many hours of his own labor as she served him? Surely it could not be less; having laid it down as a rule, that anything less would be injustice, he would not do that, surely. Would it not be very natural, that if this "independent sovereign" should happen to have labor notes drawn by others, would he not, rather than give his own, *give them?* This would certainly be all very natural; there could be nothing criminal in it. If we pay in money, it makes no difference from whom we receive it—a dollar being but a dollar; an hour's labor being but an hour's labor. The nurse would, no doubt, be glad to take it, especially if she knew the value of it; because, among the Philistines, she could get an advance of two or three hundred per cent. above what it cost her; consequently, some day the independent sovereign who drew the note, would be called upon by a man of the outer world, and be compelled to devote his physical energies to the purpose of promoting some cannibal scheme of speculation. So in drawing his "labor note," he had only set a gull-trap to catch himself!

Now, suppose a great many such transactions take place —none looking to the final result—what will be the consequence? In the course of time, they will discover that

they have only been betraying one another into the hands of Satan, the common enemy; caught in their own toils; brought back to that very state of bondage from which they had fled, having fondly anticipated that the circulation of "*labor notes*" would not only enable them to abundantly supply their wants, but likewise shield them from all harm. Whoever, therefore, attempts the practice, is fated to be disappointed. It must be evident, that labor notes circulated beyond the limits of the co-operators, can work nothing but injury to those within; and within the pale they are perfectly useless, because all the internal intercourse can be carried on just as well without as with them, by keeping accounts against each other; and when the parties settle, those who may be in debt pay up the balance, either in money, or labor, as the parties could agree. For the truth of this statement, I appeal to Mr. Warren himself.

Here I must put a query to him, and he may either answer or not, just as he thinks fit. I have no desire to interfere with his "individual sovereignty." In the year 1833, a small experimental community of some half dozen families, (Mr. Warren and myself included,) was established, for the purpose of carrying out the labor for labor principle, and from the start the use of "*labor notes*" was proscribed by the associates; and during the whole time I staid there, which was about three years, I believe, I never saw a labor note pass between any of the parties. We had ceased the practice of "*equitable commerce*" long before I left. Now the query is this,—Why were the "*labor notes*" suppressed? To speak figuratively—was it to prevent the saints from having the power of delivering their associates into the hands of the cruel Philistines? or was it not?

I am not anxious to have this query solved on my own account, but for the benefit of those who read his book. I have been asked the question by some of them; they want to know; and no man is better qualified to solve this little mystery, than Mr. Warren himself.

Another thing the readers of Mr. Warren's book want to know, is, why, in that "picture" of a "labor note," that is capable of representing, with the greatest truthfulness, almost everything under the sun, he has placed in the most conspicuous part of it, the words "*not transferable*"? Is it

to prevent the evil just now spoken of? or is it not? If it is, then why not put on the appropriate words, *Not to circulate;* then nobody would be deceived or deluded by it. But if it is not, why fasten a dead weight to it, sufficient to sink it in public estimation, so as to render it perfectly useless? Furthermore, is it right to attempt to palm upon our credulous, good feeling, and honest-intentioned fellow men, a circulating medium bearing upon the face of it a declaration forbidding people to use it for that purpose? It is plain to be seen, that if people did so use it, it would be at their own risk; for the drawer of it, by this dexterous manœuvre, would absolve himself from all *legal* responsibility. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," is an excellent maxim, and a good rule of action. Reformers generally, on discovering that most of the evils which mankind suffer, are attributable to the power and influence of money and governments, have been desirous of casting off, at once, the slavish chains that fettered and bound them. It is no wonder, then, that they have eagerly grasped at anything that had the appearance of ennabling them to pass at once from a state of injustice, oppression and misery, into one of justice, freedom and happiness. They have been sensible to the misery around them; they have beheld the promised land at a distance, and have sought to reach it by the shortest possible cut, thereby overlooking the only available and practicable means by which the passage can be effected; and the very simplicity of the only practicable means is, perhaps, the principal reason why it has been so difficult to discover. It has been in accordance with the above view, that Mr. Warren proposes to make this short and pleasant passage by means of his "labor notes"; but this vessel will never carry us across the mighty gulf. He has been obliged, by the nature of things, to load her so heavily, that if we do but analyze the cargo, and observe well the build of the craft, all thinking persons will be convinced she would sink at the moment of leaving the shore.

Mr. Warren says, page 69: "By dispensing with governments, we shake off the greatest invaders of human rights—the very nightmare of society." This is true; nothing could be more so. But government is not like a garment, that can be thrown off at pleasure, without injury to the body which it covers; but is more like the skin,

which, to strip from the body, would produce instant death, and to do this ourselves, would be nothing less than suicide. Therefore, to throw off the shackles of government at a blow, is impossible; it can only be done by degrees, by the prudent use and management of the very instruments by which we are tortured, and which enthusiastic, though well-meaning reformers, contemptuously reject and despise altogether, namely: *money and governments.* By these means, our progress will be certain and sure; when a step is once gained in this way, from it we cannot retrograde, but *must* move forward to the next in order. This course being in conformity to the immutable laws of Nature, is the only course we can pursue with any reasonable prospect of success. And whoever attempts to reform society by any other method, is fated to suffer chagrin, mortification and disappointment.

The individual operations and interests of mankind are so intimately and inseparably connected and interwoven, and our dependence so mutual, that continual close personal contact is absolutely unavoidable; it therefore behooveth us to make this contact as pleasant and as agreeable as possible, by scrupulously respecting the rights and feelings of each other, and exercising charity to the utmost. Let us endeavor to smoothe the thorny path of life, make the best use we can of the world while we are in it, and, for our final deliverance from the bondage of tyranny and oppression, let us *cheerfully, patiently wait.*

How is it possible for us to strike off at once those galling chains that so intimately connect us with money and governments? When it must be evident to all, that those who have heretofore controlled those irresistible engines, have fastened their grappling irons upon our property, and their tenter hooks into the flesh of our bodies, into the marrow of our bones—aye, even into our very heart strings, and to sever these at a blow—could but cause certain, instantaneous death. Therefore, the only course left for us to pursue, is to cut off one at a time, by means of the ballot-box; give the patient (the body politic) time to recover from the operation; then strike off another; and so continue on, until the individual man stands forth unshackled and free; then he can afford to be just, be virtuous and good; therefore, *happy. Cheerfully, patiently wait.* We may

then begin to think about the individual sovereignty of man; not till then.

One of the greatest natural curiosities of the world is, that the truth in regard to our moral, social and political relations, has been so near to us, that our mental vision has been completely blinded and confounded by its very nearness, like the Irishman who declared he could not see the town for the houses. Let us, therefore, one and all, open our eyes, our ears, and our understandings.

Mr. Warren, in conclusion, says, page 74:

"It is hoped that some who are capable of correct reasoning, will undertake to investigate, and (if they can find a motive,) to oppose Equitable Commerce, and thereby discover and *expose the utter imbecility, the surprising weakness of any opposition that can be brought against it.*"

In compliance, therefore, with said invitation, the foregoing observations are offered as a specimen of *the exposure of "the utter imbecility, the surprising weakness of the opposition* that can be brought against" the contents of his book; not against "Equitable Commerce," but against the introduction of "labor notes" as a circulating medium. And the motive that prompted them, was a desire to prevent the spread of error and delusion, and promote the cause of truth. And of this, Mr. Warren would be the last man in the world to complain. "They are presented for calm study and honest inquiry; and, having placed them fairly before" him and "the public, I shall leave them to be estimated by each individual, according to the particular measure of his understanding, and shall offer no violence to his individuality, by any attempt to restrain or to urge him beyond it." As to controversy, I am ready for that in any shape or form.

JOHN PICKERING

Cincinnati, Ohio, "U. S. A.," August 4th, 1847.

ADDENDA.—As some objections have been made to some parts of this chapter, a little explanation is necessary. At page 172, after the query, "Will men thus make martyrs of themselves?" add, *in the aggregate;* the reader will then have a correct understanding of the author's meaning. We all well know that individuals, sometimes, under the influence of a new imbibed idea, become infatuated, and, under that influence, are very apt to do things which their "sober second thoughts" would by no means approve of. Under such circumstances, then, it cannot be truly said that they act in accordance with the laws of human nature, but are mere aberrations thereof. Add the same to each of the four preceding declarations.

CHAPTER XX.

CONCLUSION.

It has been clearly shown, in the foregoing pages, that the present organization of society is one of injustice, and is based upon fundamentally false notions (not principles.) Because men do not accumulate property in proportion to their industry; but, on the contrary, those who are the makers or producers of all things, save the elements, are the owners of nothing, (virtually) not even of their own bodies. While, on the other hand, those who make or produce nothing, become the owners of all things, including the elements, and also the bodies of the producers. And when this false system of civilization has reached the zenith of perfection, the grand result is, *the idle few become inordinately rich; the industrious are starved to death.* Aye, those very individuals who created, by their labor and toil, those very inordinate riches!

Now, this is a startling announcement; but it is, nevertheless, true; the history of civilization proves it; the fact stares us in the face; in fact, no one would have the hardihood to deny it. Therefore, any system of laws which brings about these results, must be FALSE. Because the statistics of various countries show most conclusively that the physical ability of any number of inhabitants, in any country, is sufficient to create an abundance of the products of labor, for the supply of many times their own number. Thus, England is able to clothe the whole world, and America could be made to furnish all its bread stuffs. Therefore, it never can be necessary, in order to promote the prosperity of a country, to starve the poor producers to death. The statistics of the world gives the lie direct to any such assertion. There is also another reason why such a state of things need not exist, and that is, the elements of Nature are amply sufficient to sustain more than twenty times the number of inhabitants now occupying the earth. For a solution of the existence of the mysterious fact, that in proportion as the ability of a nation to

create such things as are necessary for man's existence, is increased, the more destitute and poverty-stricken becomes the majority of its inhabitants, is to be sought for in the violation of some law or laws of Nature, which experience proves cannot be done with impunity.

We have endeavored to show what that violation is, and contend that the primary cause of all the moral and social evils of society arise from that false principle incorporated into all so-called "civilized governments," of *legalizing private and exclusive property in the elements of Nature.* In other words, in *preventing by law the free and equal use of all the elements to all mankind, and in preventing the operation of competition by arbitrary law.* This great violation of the law of immutable justice, being once established by law, becomes the grand source of war, of slavery of every kind, of injustice, tyranny and oppression, and every grade of crime and misery. In short, it has converted this beautiful earth which God has placed us upon, with abundant means to make it a paradise, into a tower of Babel, a den of thieves and robbers, a world full of continual strife and contention.

Now, this proposition is true, or it is not. If it be not true, then is our labor in vain; this book goes for naught; *it is not worth a single straw*—the whole resting upon this single proposition. But it must be *true;* and that is irresistibly self-evident, from the following considerations: Is it the duty of government to prevent one man from killing another? O, certainly, certainly, would be the instantaneous response of every human being: nothing could be more self-evident. If, then, government has this right, and is its duty to prevent murder, where does it get the right to make the distinction between killing instantly, by shooting, or cutting his throat, and by killing him slowly by starvation? From where did government derive the power of making one of these modes of killing a crime, and the other a virtue? You that know, tell us; it is your duty; the people want to understand these things.

Is it not a glaring fact, staring us in the face, that, in consequence of this fatal error, the element monopolizers of Europe are starving the people to death by thousands; and those very "gentlemen," who thus starve the people to death, and those who justify and uphold the system, have the unblushing hardihood to declare that this calamity is a visitation from God, an unavoidable dispensation of Providence, when they well know it is but the work of

their own murderous hands. What impiety, what outrageous blasphemy. This result has been the work of deliberate calculation, as we have proved by quotations from several of their books. They have declared to the world that they had a right to bring about this very calamity.

But the most surprising part of this business is, that although this famine, with its consequent misery, is a direct visitation from God, we should be called upon to *resist his decrees* and *counteract his operations;* to exercise OUR piety, charity and benevolence, and attempt to rescue and deliver from the horrors of famine those miserable wretches whom God, in his wisdom and goodness, had purposely placed in that condition. Is not this calling upon us to fight against God, and to resist his will? Surely it is. But the climax of the absurdity is this, that we are to counteract the purposes of God by our own *superior charity and benevolence.* What modesty! These "paradoxical and unnatural" doctrines have been forced upon mankind, for the purpose of confounding their intellects, to prevent them from having a clear view of the fatal consequences of *land monopoly* and by those who have been well paid for *that* service. But if they can give us no better, nor a more rational view of the Infinite Divine, the Great Jehovah, they had better close their lips in everlasting silence. Thus have the blind led the blind, and all have fallen into the ditch of misery together.

If those millions of miserable wretches must be killed off—in the name of justice and mercy; in the name of every ennobling and philanthropic feeling of the human heart, why not shoot them at once, rather than kill them by the lingering, painful, horrible, heart-rending process of starvation? Would it not be better a thousand times? Let the voice of humanity answer the question.

The advocates of these "paradoxical and unnatural institutions" generally take shelter behind this argument—that inasmuch as God did not prevent the occurrence of this famine, it is, therefore, in accordance with his will. This argument might satisfy some minds; but, honest reader, does it satisfy yours? One man shoots another, stabs another, kills him instantly. God does not prevent it. Is it, therefore, his will? Would you dare say it? Think you, if those famishing millions in Europe were allowed to cultivate the land they now stand upon, and per-

mitted to consume the fruits of their toil, they would perish by starvation? Could a famine have happened? It must be obvious to all, that no such catastrophe could possibly have taken place.

Could Slavery, in any form, exist, if all men had the equal use of the elements? It could not. Neither could wars exist between one nation and another, property in land being either directly or indirectly the only pretext for them. It is the cause of our present war with Mexico, and all other wars. Remove the cause, then the effect will cease, as a matter of course; but not till then. We may abuse, villify and anathematize the individuals who bring them about, and those engaged in their prosecution, till our tongues be blistered, and our pens worn to the stump: we shall not abate the evil in the least; but, on the contrary, will be only increasing the difficulty. Because the first mentioned act from a feeling of zealous pride, under the idea of making their country great by extending her borders; of commanding respect from foreign nations; and of making their country richer by the possession of *more land*. And the latter act from the love of command, the prospect of "winning glory," pocketing *good pay;* of getting a living in that peculiar way, in preference to any other: lastly, to obtain *one hundred and sixty acres of land*.

Therefore, if governments had not legalized property in land, but the elements had been free to the use of all, no such motives could have existed; or, if they had, they could not have been acted out, for want of opportunity. Therefore, to abolish what produces such motives, is the only rational course we can pursue, while human nature is what it is. By abolishing legal money value in land, almost all the motives just mentioned would cease. Because, if all men had the free use of land, there could be none to take by conquest; consequently, a country could not become richer by extending her borders by it. All men standing upon equal footing in regard to land—the means of subsistence—none would submit to be commanded by others. Then there could be no glory to win; no high pay to pocket; no getting a living in that peculiar way; nor one hundred and sixty acres of land to be obtained, as part of the reward for taking part in a system of wholesale murder and butchery. Therefore, abolish

the cause of war, for it is the madness of folly to curse the individuals engaged in it, while those "paradoxical and unnatural institutions" exist, which as naturally produce it, as bodies gravitate towards the centre of gravity.

The contemplation of war is shocking and loathsome to all philanthropic minds. Let them, therefore, combine their efforts to remove the cause. There is one consideration which is, in some degree, consolitary to the American citizen, not enjoyed in some other countries—and that is, no citizen of the United States can be compelled, by law, to participate in any foreign war.

It will be well for us all to keep in perpetual view, that no *wrong doer* can be convinced of his error, nor made to do right, by calling him harsh names, or by exciting his anger in any manner whatever. This, all may know by appealing to their own feelings. But if we dispassionately convince him of his error, he will naturally *right* himself. To use violence in word or deed, is but to betray our own ignorance and a want of better incentives, namely, *good arguments*. But this is no reason why we should not resist aggression, when once commenced. The great wrong is in making the commencement. And if all would but observe this rule, there would be no aggression, nor retaliation either. Governments have not observed this simple rule; but, on the contrary, have in the first place aggressively violated the great law of immutable justice, by withholding the free use of the land from a great portion of the people—making it a legal subject of common merchandise. And so long as this violation exists, so long must mankind suffer the consequent penalty, agreeably to the immutable laws of God, namely, famine and pestilence, war and contention, nationally and individually. If governments set a bad example, is it any wonder if the people should follow? Certainly not. It is the most natural thing in the world.

If, then, the foregoing principles be true, what is the duty of the legislator? Merely obey the will of his constituents; nothing more—like the lawyer. And when the people know what *right* is, they *will*, and must, therefore, have it. First. Make the public lands free to actual settlers, in limited quantities, and the homestead inalienable Second. Abolish all special privileges. When this is accomplished, at least one-half the work of National Reform is done.

Having placed all men upon the same footing in regard to the elements, no man can charge another for the use of them. *Free* competition will naturally introduce, practically, "*Equitable Commerce*," or "*labor for labor*," and "*individual sovereignty*." Next in order, "Associative Attractive Industry." This will be easily accomplished, because the elements will cost nothing; the use of capital will be had at the cost of production, and, consequently, the use of labor-saving machinery for the wear and tear. And more than this, no man either would or could ask for.

To sum up, then, the whole proposed remedy, as a cure for the moral, social and political evils which afflict mankind, may be accomplished in the following words:

First. The free use of the elements to all, without charge.

Second. Perfect free competition.

The principal reason why competition has heretofore been so productive of evil, is because all governments have been nothing more than a grand, overwhelming combination of the interests of idle capitalists, invented, concocted, and put into operation, for the express purpose of counteracting the natural equalizing tendency of free competition. Competition only becomes antagonistical to the happiness of man, when the LAND LORDS and the MONEY LORDS are closely combined on the one hand, and the producing classes isolated on the other.

Thus, then, is the grand problem of man's misery, and his moral, social, and political relations, solved, and our task is nearly done. Let but the down-trodden millions understand these principles, and, in proportion as they do, so does the day of their redemption draw nigh. And, ere long, Justice, who has been banished from the earth ever since governments began, will find an abiding place among men, and we shall see her as she really is—a being most lovely to behold. Not with a terrible, dark and frightful withering frown, and eyes bandaged; but with a countenance brightly beaming with a benevolent and cheerful smile, and eyes wide open. Not clad in a red and bloody garment; but in one of pure and unsullied whiteness, unstained by legal crime and blood. Not armed with a bloody two-edged sword, prepared to annihilate the majority of mankind from the face of the earth; but richly laden with an abundance of all the blessings and comforts

of life; distributing, with a liberal and unsparing hand, to all mankind; loudly proclaiming, Ye sons and daughters of Humanity, weep no more; dry up your tears; the day of your redemption draweth nigh; the reign of injustice. tyranny, and oppression, is no more. Then may men afford to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. Then will all warlike instruments be turned into ploughshares and pruning-hooks, and nations will learn war no more. The lion shall lie down with the lamb, and a young child shall lead them. Then will the reign of peace on earth, and good will to man, begin. Then may every man sit peaceably under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none in the land to make him afraid.

Producers of wealth, wake up; organize yourselves into societies, associations, and reading clubs; discuss the subject of your wrongs; circulate and encourage "National Reform" newspapers, especially "Young America," the great pioneer of Reform. Institute courts of Humanity, for the purpose of testing the validity of governmental acts, whether they be in accordance with the law of immutable justice, and the common rights of Humanity, or not. Make known the results of your decisions to your suffering fellow men, in order that they may learn how to cast off those chains which so grievously bind, degrade and enslave them.

We are now through with the subject, and sincerely hope the reader has been, in some degree, benefited by a perusal of the work. If he has, we shall be abundantly rewarded in the reflection that our labor has not been altogether in vain; but, like the "bread cast upon the waters, may be seen after many days." And let us all heartily rejoice and be thankful that the wisdom of Providence has pointed out a way so clear that he who runs may read, and, as he reads, may understand, by which the suffering millions may cast off the shackles which land monopoly and the combination of capital have so tightly fastened upon them, and they stand forth as FREE MEN, virtuous and happy. Remember the "BALLOT BOX"; pledge your candidates to the right measures.

Every man being an inseparable, integral part of the government under which he lives, is, therefore, not blameable or responsible for his actions, providing he violates none

of its laws. If the government is based upon false or vicious principles, his conduct, in the aggregate, will be vicious—modified, however, in some degree, by each individual's peculiar organization. And, on the contrary, if the laws of a government are based upon Truth, and in accordance with the rights of Humanity, then the conduct of the people, in the aggregate, will be good and virtuous in proportion. Whoever learns this truth clearly, will, on making the discovery, find himself delivered of much of the gall and bitterness he had previously harbored towards his fellow men.

It is stated in the June number of "The People's Journal," published in London, by John Saunders, and of the progressive reform character, that the mechanical power of the labor-saving machinery of Great Britain is estimated at *eight hundred millions of adults!* nearly equal to the whole population of the globe. It is also stated in the same paper, that "the labor of one man is equal to the maintainance of three persons." Now, if these statements be true, Great Britain is competent to create a sufficiency of wealth for the maintainance of nearly three times the present population of the world! and yet, with the possession of this astonishing power to produce wealth, the great majority of the working classes are in a state of utter destitution, and many in a state of starvation. Verily, these things bring forcibly to mind "Ned Lacy's paradox," and is a problem for "National Reformers" to solve practically, which they certainly will do.

The following is also from an English paper, and will be of some importance to the cause of "National Reform":

"Extraordinary Statement.—A comparison of the registers of mortality, says an English paper, will convince us that a hero placed in the trenches of a beleagured fortress, where he is exposed for weeks to a continual shower of cannon shot, or placed on a field of battle, before the bravest and most resolute of his enemies, has a much better chance of life, runs less risk of a premature death, than if he worked in an undrained street, and slept in a crowded room in Bristol or Liverpool. The chance of life was, at the

Siege of Flushing, - - -	450 to 1
Siege of Antwerp, - - -	63 to 1
Siege at Badajos	54 to 1

Battle of Waterloo,	- -	30 to 1
Shopkeeping, Liverpool,	- -	19 to 1
Weaving, Manchester,	- -	17 to 1
Saw-making, Sheffield,	- -	14 to 1"

The following letter from Dr. Denton is of too important a character to be lost. It is worthy of a much more conspicuous place than the pages of this work. It deserves to be kept before the people continually, and ought to be promulgated by every possible means. It is under these considerations that I take the liberty of inserting it here, as being one of the means of keeping the subject before the people. I here express my obligations to the gentleman who sent me the copy, just in time for insertion. The announcement contained in the letter is startling. Is it possible that those who create, by their physical energies, all the wealth of the country, should only be enabled to preserve, for their own use, *two-elevenths* of the whole? But the most astonishing part of the announcement is, that the remaining *nine-elevenths* should fall into the hands of those that produce nothing!

Now, if this announcement be true, surely no one would vindicate, or attempt to justify and continue in existence, a system of laws and usages as produce such unequal results. Surely, no man in the least disposed to be just towards his fellow men, could countenance the thing *one moment:* the injustice is too glaring.

Let every producer reflect, that *every time* he receives from the hands of the capitalist two dollars, as a reward for his labor, so every time do our laws and customs keep out of his hands, and put beyond his control, nine more dollars (which, in justice, is equally his,) into the hands of the idle capitalist, and for which he (the capitalist,) gives no consideration or equivalent whatever. By this we see *that idleness is four and a half times better rewarded than honest industry!* Thus do our "paradoxical and unnatural institutions" discourage and condemn honest industry, while a high premium is given for the encouragement of useless idleness. This is a subject worthy of deep reflection, and the understanding of which is of the utmost consequence to the honest producer. However, every one must perceive the folly of blaming or stigmatizing the individuals engaged in those practices. The fault is not in them, but in our "paradoxical and unnatural institutions." There-

fore, let all who wish to see a better state of things, examine and critically scrutinize the remedy proposed in this work, and if found competent to produce the desired result, lose no time nor opportunity in promulgating the principles herein developed. But if, on the contrary, they do not appear competent, and something better can or has been discovered, let that have the preference, and let no time be lost in giving the information to suffering Humanity; and in either case I shall be equally happy. No matter from where comes truth, so we do but have it.

"From the Michigan Expositor.

"LETTER FROM DR. DENTON TO THE FARMERS' MEETING.

"ANN ARBOR, December, 1843.

MESSRS. JOHN HOWLAND, JOHN CAVENDER, LEWIS KEMP, AND OTHERS:—

"Observing your names to a call for a meeting of the Farmers of Lenawee, to further the farming interests of the county, &c., I, with a slight hope of being some service to you and the community in general, have felt impelled to address you a letter, stating some facts and observations at which I have arrived after much reflection, believing them somewhat applicable to the object you seem to have in view.

"*That wealth is but the accumulated creations of labor*, is a cardinal and obvious truth, which none will pretend to deny. But how is it, that those who *create* it all, are enabled to retain so little for their own share, is a phenomenon which requires explanation.

"What sum in dollars will represent the value of the annual products of the United States in all branches of production?

"Different answers have been given to this interesting question, by various statisticians, some estimating them as high as 1,300, and others as high as 15 or 1,600 millions of dollars.

"But in these estimates, I have found that several large items have been twice, and others thrice reckoned. For instance, our wool is first estimated, and then it is again reckoned in our manufactured woolens, and just so of our cotton and cotton goods.

"Our grain is first estimated, and then reckoned over again in the products of our flouring mills. The annual value of our lumber, bricks, and lime, is first put down, and then it is all re-estimated in the value of the buildings annually erected. The lumber, metals, cordage, &c., are first estimated, and then reckoned over again, in the annual value of ships built; and the cordage, sails, &c.. had been estimated once previously, in the value of the flax

and hemp crops; and thus we might go on through a very large catalogue. It will readily be perceived, that this mode of analysis will reduce the estimates of some economists very much.

"We have deducted one item more from our estimates, viz: the *necessary subsistence* of the laborers. Food, clothing, and lodging, are indispensable, even for slaves; and all that is *absolutely necessary for that object*, we have excluded in our calculations, and thus make the aggregate annual products of industry, of all the laboring classes of the United States, over and above so much food and clothing, as a master, in the pursuit of his own interest, would allow his slaves, amount to $1,046,186,000.

"Now, it is obvious that all the wealth which any man, or any class of men in the United States, obtains in any way, is derived directly or indirectly from this original sum.

"Now, if we can arrive at the sum which each class of non-producers annually receives, the remainder will be the amount left for distribution among those who create it all.

"For this purpose, we have gone into a very thorough and minute examination, to ascertain the amount annually distributed to each of the non-producing classes in the United States, viz:

"THE AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED TO THE LAWYERS, AND ALL OTHERS ENGAGED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW;

"THE AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED TO THE BANKERS AND BROKERS, &C;

"THE AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED FOR TOWNSHIP, COUNTY, STATE, VILLAGE, TOWN, CITY, AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENT PURPOSES;

'THE AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED TO OUR MERCHANTS;

"THE AMOUNT ADDED TO THE PUBLIC BURDENS, CONSEQUENT UPON THE PRESENT MODE OF COLLECTING THE UNITED STATES REVENUE, &C.

"These aggregate sums amount to $889,087,409, leaving for distribution among the laborers, $157,097,591. This is the laborers' portion, over and above such necessaries as a prudent master would provide for a slave, when acting in conformity to his own interests.

"But for the sake of being on the safe side in these calculations, and for the purpose of reducing the figures to round numbers, I will call the latter sum 200 millions, and the former sum 900 millions of dollars, making 1100 millions of dollars in all.

"This, you will perceive, distributes about nine-elevenths of the aggregate products of the industry of the country to the non-producing classes, leaving but two-elevenths for those whose labor produces it all.

"Of course, you cannot feel any great confidence in these bare statements, unaccompanied by the statistics and other data by which I have arrived at these results; but the limits which must be prescribed for this epistle, will not admit of my giving them in this place; yet I would here observe, that I found much greater fa-

cility in proceeding with these intricate estimates and calculations, than I had anticipated; as, in most instances, I have been able to arrive at the same general result, by two or more different modes of calculations, each based upon a different set of facts, thus proving one another. You will not, therefore, think strange, if I place great confidence in them.

"The laborers, then, of this country, already yield up to the non-producing classes nine-elevenths of all the wealth which their toil creates, and the tendency is still onward; the non-producing classes are constantly increasing in numbers, and growing more exorbitant in their demands, till soon another eleventh will be taken from you, and ere long another, when a bare subsistence will be all that is left to the laboring man.

"England arrived at this stage several years ago, to which we are now looking forward; and one would suppose, when a nation had arrived at this crisis, it could go no farther; but not so with England; for the ponderous machinery still moved on, until labor would barely procure two meals of victuals per day, and raiment and lodging in proportion; and, at this very moment, a struggle is going on, if the period has not already arrived, when the demands of the non-producing classes sponge up all but one meal per day for the laborer, and a few rags for raiment; and the same causes are in operation here, working out the same appalling results. Increase but slightly the expenses of our complicated forms of government, and our cumbersome system of jurisprudence—afford more facilities for the increase of bankers and brokers, and let a few more enter into mercantile pursuits, &c.—and these non-producers will be so numerous, as to consume the products of your industry, leaving but a beggarly subsistence for the laboring classes.

"And who cannot perceive a steady growth in the numbers and demands of non-producers in this country? They are gradually becoming more corpulent and more numerous, and thus steadily trenching upon the earnings of the laborers.

"The great interest of the laboring classes, then, is to dispense with as many non-producers as possible, and reduce the emoluments of such as are *indispensable*, as low as the case admits; for the more these get in the way, the less wealth there is for those who create it all. The labor of the country produces but a given amount, and the question is, who shall have it? *The more there is bestowed upon the non-producers, the less there can be left for the laborers.*

"For the purpose of illustrating the mode in which your substance passes into the hands of non-producers, and making some estimates of the enormity of its amount, let us select, for the sake of illustration, one class, viz:

MERCANTILE NON-PRODUCERS.

"In 1840, the number of inhabitants in Michigan, was 212,267, and the number of retail establishments was 612; being one for every 58 families of six persons each. The proportion is less in the South Western States, and more for the Eastern, being one to about 33 families in New York and Massachusetts, and one to every 49 families of six persons each for the United States at large

"Michigan then supported 612 retail establishments, with all their families and servants, and expensive rents of dwelling houses and store houses, clerks' wages, the expenses of 612 mercantile agents going to New York City and back again twice a year. These country merchants buy of Jobbers who have already realized a profit on these goods, and the Jobbers buy of Wholesalers or Commission Houses, who had previously realized a considerable profit.

"Any one must perceive that the extreme complication of this mercantile system will render it enormously expensive, especially when we take into the account, that all these different varieties of mercantile agents are supported in a style superior to that of the producing classes.

"By diligent inquiry among men who have been engaged in business, as importing and commission merchants, and others who are experienced in jobbing, and then again among those who are experienced as retailers, I am led to estimate these mercantile profits thus:

"The commission or importing merchant sells $100 worth of goods to the jobber, and adds 15 per cent., making $115 (this sale is always quoted as the wholesale price, in price-current tables.) The *jobber* adds 20 per cent., and sells to the retailer or country merchant, who must pay, of course, $135. The retailer now adds 33⅓ per cent., and sells to the customer, the latter having to pay, at this rate, $181 for what originally cost the importing or commission merchant but $100. The cost of freight, on an average, for merchandise, from New York to Ann Arbor, is estimated at 5 per cent., which, being deducted, leaves 79 per cent. for mercantile profits. These estimates, of course, are intended as an average, many articles paying more, and others less profits.

"But again, every country must sell as much as it buys; and here is another mercantile profit, realized by some one, on what is sold.

"For instance: In May last, a barrel of flour in Ann Arbor, was worth $3,12½, and in New York City it was worth at the same time $4,88; and it cost $1,10 to transport it: so the New York City merchant would purchase the flour when it arrived, pay the transportation charge, and give to the Michigan merchant, or flour dealer, 21 per cent. profit on his investment.

"In transporting a barrel of flour, we in effect transport 5 bushels of wheat, which, at $1,10 per bbl. would be equivalent to 25 cts. per bushel; but when Western wheat is worth $1,00 per bushel in

New York City, the market price here does not exceed 56 cts. This will pay the transportation, and net the Michigan wheat dealer 38 per cent. on his purchase money; or if we allow 25 cents per bushel for transportation, the New York price pays 34 per cent. profit on the purchase money. We suppose other articles of export pay the dealers as high a profit, if not higher: but for the purpose of being on the safe side, we will call the average mercantile profits on our exports 21 per cent., which being added to the 79 per cent. profits on the merchandise, make 100 per cent. in mercantile profits, besides paying costs of transportation both ways; that is, the farmers of Washtenaw pay 100 per cent. besides the expense of transportation both ways, for the purpose of changing the products of their industry into merchandise. They give one barrel of flour to get another exchanged for merchandise, besides paying for bringing the goods here and carrying the flour to New York City.

"To test the correctness of the above estimates, let me advise you to examine very frequently, and compare the prices current of New York City with those of your own country. For this purpose, I took up the New York Express of the 15th of September, by which I learned that Illinois and Michigan wheat was selling for $1,00 per bushel in New York City. In Ann Arbor it was selling for 56 cents.

"An article of Brown Sheeting was quoted in New York at 5 cents. (It must be recollected that the wholesale prices, as quoted, are the prices at which the jobbers purchase of the importers or commission houses, after the first profit of 15 per cent. is added.) In Ann Arbor, a similar article of Brown Sheeting to that named in the Express, was selling for 9 cents; so in New York City a bushel of Michigan wheat would pay for 20 yards of this Brown Sheeting at wholesale, and at the same time in Ann Arbor one bushel of wheat would pay for but 6 yards and 32-100ths at retail

"Bleached Sheeting, one yard wide, was quoted at 7 cents In Ann Arbor a similar article was selling for 11 cents. So in New York City one bushel of wheat would buy 14 yards 3-10ths of this sheeting, and in Ann Arbor it would pay for but 5 yards and 1-11th.—In the same paper was quoted "plaids, stripes, fast colors, checks, yard wide, at 7 cents." On enquiring of one of our merchants, he said goods of the same description were selling here at 13 cents per yard So in New York City, a bushel of Michigan wheat would pay for 14 yards 3-10ths, when in Ann Arbor a bushel would pay for but 4 yards 3-10ths. Or in other words, it would require 3 bushels 3-10 of wheat, to purchase as much of these articles in Ann Arbor, as one barrel would buy in New York City.

"Through the summer, and now, rice is quoted in New York at from 2 to 3 cents, and but seldom so high as 3. We will call it 2½ per pound on an average. In Washtenaw County the majority of retailers have sold rice steadily, as high as 7 cents during the last

summer. So in New York, one bushel of wheat would pay for 40 lbs. of rice, and in Washtenaw but 8 lbs. Or 40 lbs. of rice in New York City, would purchase but one bushel of wheat, and here 40lbs. of rice would pay for 5 bushels of wheat. And thus we might go on through the whole catalogue of merchandise; but enough has been shown to demonstrate to any one, that the estimated mercantile profits as above stated are not too high.

"The problem to be solved is, how much of this 100 per cent. of mercantile profits can be got rid of, if any; and in what way is the reform to be brought about? We should not be in haste to act on any of these important subjects, until we have elicited all the facts; for any action based on meagre or defective information, must result disastrously to the undertaking. Our principal object, then, at present, should be *facts*, and their general promulgation; and if the above estimates approximate to the truth, and the public become well informed on the subject, we must all confess our mistake in the American character, if some practical scheme of relief is not discovered and put in execution.

"Positive knowledge being the great desideratum, we ought not at present to distract our attention, by any very anxious inquiry about the remedy, leaving that to develope itself, as it most assuredly will, after a thorough understanding of the evils and their extent. But as no one can contemplate these evils long, without reflecting more or less upon different plans of relief, so several have been suggested to my own mind, *one* of which I shall here mention,—deeming it of no other importance however, than a mere suggestion.

"Let the State appoint two or more mercantile agents, to reside in New York City, and New England, for the purpose of making purchases, &c., for the State, and selling all the produce from the State consigned to them.

"Each county on the start, will furnish them, with a conplete list of the spring and fall purchases of merchandise for the previous year. These, with the constant correspondence which would be kept up, would enable them to purchase for the whole State, with as much ease and accuracy, as a merchant now can for a single firm; and by purchasing in such large quantities, they would be enabled to procure all kinds of American goods, of the factories at first cost, and foreign goods at cargo prices, thus avoiding the profits of the jobbing and commission Merchants too, in a great measure; by which means all our purchases would be made at first cost, except a few of the foreign articles, and these at a great abatement of the usual profits of 15 per cent. Thus they would be enabled to buy 9-10ths of our goods at first cost, and the remainder at so low a rate that one per cent., on the whole purchases, would cover the addition to the first cost.

"The appropriate number of unbroken packages, would be marked and forwarded to each county in the State.

"For instance, those consigned to Washtenaw, would be received at a suitable *depot*, in a building possessing suitable conveniences for distributing them, where nothing would be received in exchange for goods but a certificate of produce or money, deposited with some proper officer. Frequent or daily advices from our State agents would enable our county distributors to know what prices it would answer to allow for produce from day to day.

"This would enable us to avoid all the mercantile profits on our produce and all but about one per cent. on our merchandise. But our state agents and clerks, and the expenses of each county for distributing the goods is unprovided for; all of which, added to the one per cent. above, would make it all amount to but 10 per cent. instead of 100, as it now does.

"The present costs of transportation are too high, and too many persons are making livings and fortunes out of them. The number of carriers is small, however, compared with those who do business with them; consequently the former can combine against the latter, and extort almost any rates they please; but if one man were acting for the whole State, he would have it in his power to make almost any terms he chooses, by offering the business of the whole State to the transportation company that would do it cheapest. You find charged in the present bills of freight, *wharfage*, *truckage*, *storeage*, *cooperage*, at Detroit, and again at Buffalo, and again at New York City, with the additional items there of *inspection* and *commission*; and perhaps nine-tenths of these charges are purely fictitious and could be avoided by a comprehensive system.—And besides all these, such an agent could treat with the State of New York for a reduction of tolls, inspection, &c., which would in all likelihood be abated, to prevent us passing through the Welland Canal.

"A barrel of flour can be carried from Albany to Boston, over the railroad, all the way by land, 160 miles, at a cost to the company of but 16 cents. The present price of freight on agricultural produce, from Michigan to New York City, all the way by water, amounts to 33 or 33⅓ per cent, on its cost. These, with many other considerations, teach us that at present, freight both ways is quite too high; and, under a comprehensive system, might be greatly reduced, so much, perhaps, as to get our merchandise carried for 2 per cent. instead of 5, and our exports for 20, instead of 33⅓ per cent. We should not deem it impossible to reduce the price of freight ultimately, so that a barrel of flour could be transported all the way for 50 cents, which would make wheat worth 90 cents in Michigan, when it is worth $1 in New York City.

More moderate reductions in freight, than those we have intmated, would save enough to pay our mercantile agents for the State, and defray the expenses of distributing the goods.

Some might be apprehensive of defalcations in our agents; but

the revenues of our counties, states and nation, and the revenues of all nations, are all entrusted to the hands of men; and the ratio of defalcations is next to nothing.

"Our state and county organizations now of so little use, except to mere politicians, would then be converted to purposes of real utility to the masses, if we would but invoke them to furnish our laboring men with as many of the necessaries of life, for one day's work, one bushel of wheat or one barrel of flour, as they now obtain for two

"You will perceive that goods throughout the United States, when bought at retail, are charged with nearly the same amount of mercantile profits, and differ slightly in price according to the difference in cost of transportation; but the last, when compared with the first, is always small at most. And yet our age has displayed a most laudable zeal, in lessening the cost of transportation, by the construction of canals, railroads, &c., rightly deeming itself well paid for any amount of time spent in legislation, and the outlay of enormous sums of money, if 5 or 10 per cent. could thus be saved on the cost of goods; but is it not probable, that much less time spent in legislation, and a much smaller sum of money in establishing a comprehensive mercantile system, could save 50 or 100 per cent.?

"I hope you will not suppose, that I attach any importance to this suggestion of a remedy.—More information is what is desirable at present, not only in reference to our mercantile, but all other classes of non-producers. The grand inquiry should be, how to restore to the producers ten-elevenths of their earnings, instead of extorting nine-elevenths, and making constant encroachments on the remainder.

"Cannot the farmers and other laboring classes of Michigan, establish a weekly or semi-monthly paper, which shall be devoted to an investigation of their interests, in all their bearings; and through the columns of which, the producing class can hold intercourse for the interchange of opinions? Yours, &c.,

"S. DENTON."

A few songs will be now subjoined, suitable for singing in clubs and "National Reform" meetings, imparting amusement, instruction, and good fellow feeling.

FREEMAN'S SONG.

TUNE—*Old Rosin the Beau.*

Come, all ye true friends of the nation,
Attend to humanity's call:
Come, aid the domain's liberation,
And roll on the Agrarian ball.

The Agrarian hosts are advancing;
The freedom of land they declare;
The down-trodden millions are crying,
Come, break up our gloom of despair.

Ye Democrats, come to the rescue,
And aid on the Agrarian cause,
And millions will rise up and bless you
With heart-cheering songs of applause.

Let Whiggery forsake its minions,
And boldly step into our ranks;
We care not for party opinions;
But invite all the friends of the Banks.

And when we have formed the blest union,
We'll firmly march on, one and all;
We'll sing when we meet in communion,
And roll on the Agrarian ball.

The question of test is now turning,
And free soil or monopoly must fall;
While hope in the bosom is burning,
We'll roll on the Agrarian ball.

Ye freemen, attend to your voting;
Your ballots will answer the call;
While others attend to log-rolling,
We'll roll on the Agrarian ball.

LINES.

BY J. R LOWELL.

We will speak out. We will be heard,
Though all earth's systems crack;
We will not bate a single word,
Nor take a letter back.

We speak the truth, and what care we
For hissing and for scorn,
While some faint gleamings we can see
Of freedom's coming morn?

Let liars fear; let cowards shrink;
Let traitors turn away;
Whatever we have dared to think,
That dare we also say!

THE BALLOT BOX.

Freedom's consecrated dower,
Casket of a priceless gem!
Nobler heritage of power,
Than imperial diadem!
Corner-stone, on which was rear'd
Liberty's triumphal dome,
When her glorious form appeared
'Midst our own green mountain home

Purchas'd by as noble blood
As in mortal veins e'er run,
By the toil of those who stood
By the side of Washington—
By the hearts that met the foe
On their native battle plain,
Where the arm that strikes the blow,
Never needs to strike again!

Where's the craven that would dare
Mar it with polluted breath?
Scorned and curs'd, be his to share
The traitor's shame, the traitor's death
Let his faithless heart be torn,
From his reckless bosom riven,
And upon the whirlwind borne,
To the carrion kite be given!

Guard it, freeman! guard it well!
Spotless as your maidens' fame!
Never let your children tell
Of your weakness, of your shame!
That their fathers basely sold
What was bought with blood and toi
That you bartered right for gold,
Here on Freedom's sacred soil!

Let your eagle's quenchless eye,
Fixed, unstrung, sleepless, bright,
Watch, when danger hovers nigh,
From his lofty mountain height:
While the stripes and stars shall wave
O'er this treasure, pure and free,
The land's Palladium, it shall save
The home and shrine of Liberty

SEVEN SHORT ANTHEMS.

AIR—*Woodman, Spare that Tree.*

In this which gnaws my heart,
I'd spare ancestry's name:
But their neglected part
Will live to cry their shame:
Half-living millions groan
And bleed, in tyrant's chains!
And every gash and moan
Are everlasting stains!

AIR—*My Highland Home.*

Our fathers' homes, where Freedom dwelt,
And plenty smiled around,
Dream'd not that want would soon be felt.
And land lords' slaves abound.
Our grandames, gleeful round the fire,
Maids, in their fathers' homes,
Did live to see our rights expire,
And Freedom's foe exhumed.
I 'll grieve no more for freedom lost,
Nor rate our fathers' tombs;
Those days of liberty are past—
Our fathers' happy homes!

AIR—*Exile of Erin.*

The yoke is upon us too firmly to break it,
Forever lords' things we hereafter must be.
A century since might it have been prevented:
Our fathers secured, as they sung, liberty.
The hopes of the down-trodden millions are blighted,
O'er Earth, as they see our Republic benighted;
As viewing her glory, in which they delighted,
O'ercast, to proclaim that they cannot be free

AIR—*Marselloise Hymn.*

Unless we rouse, in might, for freedom,
Impelled, by all we love, to rise,
By all we hate in tyrants' thraldom,
By all we hope beyond the skies.—
Shall we remain supinely lying,
When we have strength and right to do?

I think the air is rent with NO.
And ere the world has ceased their sighing,
We might to arms again,
Th' avenging sword unsheath,
Redeem the name of Freedom's sons,
In liberty or death!

AIR—*Star Spangled Banner.*

That thus it might be, is the prayer of my heart;
But the hirelings' fell swords at our throats would be pointed.
Our wives and their infants would be cut apart,
And their limbs, by these butchers, before us, disjointed.
O God! could I hope, that, our cause being just,
We still might succeed; and, with one spirit, trust
That our Star Spangled Banner, in triumph, may wave
O'er this land again free, and the home of the brave!

AIR—*Battle and the Breeze.*

Could we unfurl that flag again,
Our freedom we'd secure;
The LORD should not the LAND retain,
But give it to the poor.
Each man's would be his neighbor's right—
One universal peace;
Our spangled flag of Freedom's light
Would wave till Time shall cease!

AIR—*Away to the Mountain's Brow.*

I will away, to impart the fire
That is in my bosom burning,
And rouse the Land's avenging ire,
The oppressor's wrong o'erturning.
And helpless, my wife, I leave with thy brood;
Innocence be their guardian and friend:
For again, in their midst, will I never taste food
Till Oppression to Freedom shall bend!
Then I'll away to impart the fire,
Away, away, away, away!

SONS OF TOIL.

Arise! degraded sons of toil!
Too long you've foully bent the knee
To impious drones, who claim the soil,
Which God for *all* created free:
If brave, and to ourselves but true,
I ask you what we cannot do?

A bitter destiny, alas!
Has ours been through the course of time:
A poor, despised, deluded class,
In every age, in every clime!
Of demagogues and wealthy knaves,
We're still the willing dupes and *slaves!*

The wealth which ingrate tyrants wield,
To crush and starve us, *we* create;
The blood we shed on flood and field
Gives greatness to the *misnamed* great:
But short would reign this favored few,
Were we but to each other true.

"WAIT A LITTLE LONGER."

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
We may not live to see the day,
But earth shall glisten in the ray
Of the good time coming.
Cannon balls may aid the truth,
But thought's a weapon stronger;
We'll win our battles by its aid;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
The pen shall supercede the sword,
And right, not might, shall be the lord,
In the good time coming.
Worth, not birth, shall rule mankind,
And be acknowledged stronger,
The proper impulse has been given;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
War in all men's eyes shall be
A monster of iniquity,
In the good time coming.
Nations shall not quarrel then,
To prove which is the stronger;
Nor slaughter men for glory's sake;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
Hateful rivalries of creed
Shall not make their martyrs bleed.
In the good time coming.
Religion shall be shorn of pride.
And flourish all the stronger·
And Charity shall trim her lamp;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
And a poor man's family
Shall not be his misery,
In the good time coming.
Every child shall be a help,
To make his right arm stronger;
The happier he, the more he has;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
Little children shall not toil,
Under, or above, the soil,
In the good time coming:
But shall play in healthful fields.
Till limbs and minds grow stronger;
And every one shall read and write;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
The people shall be temperate,
And shall love, instead of hate,
In the good time coming.
They shall use, and not abuse,
And make all virtue stronger.
The reformation has begun;—
Wait a little longer.

There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming:
Let us aid it all we can,
Every woman, every man,
The good time coming.
Smallest helps, if rightly given,
Make the impulse stronger;
'Twill be strong enough one day;—
Wait a little longer.

TO WORKING MEN.

Arouse, ye patient, laboring throng;
Your sacred rights may rest too long;
A sordid knave,* becoming strong,
  Will wrest from you your liberty.

See how he grasps your wide domain!
See him resist the poor man's claim!
Upon his front there sits no shame;
  He 's callous to all misery.

Behold Rhode Island's noble Son
Immured for what our sires had done!
He would a bloodless victory won.
  Alas for Tyler's sympathy.

Awake! step forth! for rights contend!
Be firm, united, to this end!
To you opposing force must bend,
  Despite its royal tyranny.

At home, abroad, from East to West.
The God of Mammon rears his crest.
While toiling millions, all unblest.
  Neglected, die in poverty

Where cities stand in proud array!
Where armies meet in dreadful fray;
There poor 'gainst poor must pave the way
  To royal wealth or victory!

The poor are slaves in every clime;
Their very poverty is crime!
While wealth is honored and may shine
  Devoid of all humanity!

Th' unrighteous toil of youth and age,
Whose rights are mocked at every stage,
Will be condemned on history's page
  As wanton acts of cruelty. J. D. F

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS.

Awake, MAN! awake from the slumbers that bind you·
The darkness is fleeing that long hath confin'd you;

* Money Power.

The sun is arising in splendor on high;
"*My Rights I demand!*" be your watchword and cry.
The weapons of Truth you shall wield not in vain;
By its power your rights you shall quickly regain.
Press on in your course, till dark Error gives way,
Then light will burst forth in meridian day.
No weapon unsheath but the RIGHTS of your cause;
They will vanquish your foe, and repeal unjust laws;
They will cut through their ranks, their menace make void;
Your strength is in Truth; "your hope is in God."
Then lift up your voice in a tone of command,
And your right is restored—*your Right to the Land!*

D R.

THE LABORER'S LAMENT.

AIR—"*Marble Halls.*"

O cruel, most cruel, the laborer sigh'd,
The fate of the African slave,
Who crouches in silence, his master beside,
From infancy down to his grave.
But though he is fetter'd, and forced to resign
His right to the pleasures of earth,
The state of that captive is nobler than mine,
For Want never visits his hearth.

'Tis not his to suffer the torture of mind,
That pains me at thought of my wife—
To see her, though fainting, still patient and kind—
Still facing the hardships of life.
For oft, when her little ones ask her for bread,
She turns from their presence to weep—
Compell'd to refuse it, and send them to bed,
With hunger to haunt them in sleep.

Bnt should my poor children misfortune outlive,
And enter, unletter'd, the world,
The sire of their being they ne'er can forgive,
But curses on him will be hurl'd;—
And when, in my sorrow and anguish of soul,
I brood o'er the evils I've sown,
The conflict of feeling is past my control.
And reason abandons her throne.

DREAMER.

THE WORKING MEN'S LEAGUE.

TUNE—"*Old Dan Tucker.*"

Come, all you who are fond of singing,
Let us set a song a ringing;
Sound the chorus strong and hearty,
And we'll make a jovial party.
Get out of the way, you speculators;
You shall no longer be dictators.

Some love *Rents* and speculation;
Some with *Banks* would fill the nation;
In a lump we'll class these *critturs*,
And we'll call them speculators.
Get out of the way, &c.

He who lives by labor only,
Ne'er shall find his fireside lonely;
But his home a happy place is.
Blest with cheerful, smiling faces.
Get out of the way, &c.

Interest steals a man's good feelings;
He's a rogue in all his dealings;
Smirks and smiles, until he's found you;
Then, O, crackey! how he's bound you.
Get out of the way, &c.

All who wish for homes to bless them;
All who wish the girls to kiss them;
Hark! while soberness is o'er us.
Here's a song, and this the chorus:
Get out of the way, &c.

Once we used to *beg to labor;*
Then to toil was thought a favor;
We'll have a home all smiling, sunny,
Without price and without money.
Get out of the way, &c.

Time was, once, when honest worker.
Were put upon a par with porkers;*
But now a new reform's beginning;
Selling land is now a sinning.
Get out of the way, &c.

* "Swinish multitude."

See the Agrarian Ball a rolling;
Hark! the knell of Avarice tolling!
Roll the ball to every station,
In our own great Yankee nation.
Push along, and keep it moving;
The People's Cause is still improving.

Satan saw his trade was failing;
Heard no more the orphans' wailing;
Sent his imps about us yelling,
"Don't stop! don't stop! but keep on selling!
Get out of the way, you old Land Seller;
You're a loafing, crafty *feller*.

True, you once did *price* demand.
For what was Nature's gift, *the Land;*
Boast you may that you have done it:
Reform's on foot, and you can't come it.
Get out of the way, though you have done it
Reform's the word, and you can't come it.

Monopolists, now just be a thinking;
No more at such great wrong be winking;
Come on, and own that you're mistaken;
Sign the pledge, and save your bacon.
Push it along, and keep it moving;
The People's Cause is still improving.

LAYS OF FREEDOM.

Cheer up! ye strugglers for the right,
Ye lovers of the true;
A brighter day shall open yet,
Through what ye dare and do!

It may not be your lot to live,
That day of joy to share;
But still most thankful ye should feel,
The good way to prepare.

The way for Truth's triumphal march
O'er a succeeding race,
Mercy with whom shall hold the sway,
In dark oppression's place.

Yes, sure as ye, with faithful hearts.
Toil on in duty's sphere,
Justice shall take the place of might.
With mercy for compeer.

Cheer, then. ye strugglers for the right.
Ye lovers of the true;
A brighter day shall open yet,
Through what ye dare and do!

THE AGRARIAN GATHERING.

TUNE—"*Hunters of Kentucky.*"

Hark! with a firm and manly tread
The Agrarians are coming!
No cap and bells upon the head;
No fiddling and no drumming:
To clownish antics to excite
The jest of each derider,
As if they'd sunk their manhood quite
In puncheons of hard cider.

No banners deck'd with thievish coons.
Nor mottoes foul and scurvy,
With decency, and common sense,
And truth turned topsy-turvy;
But, marching with unbroken front,
All resolute and steady,
They come, as they are ever wont,
For TRUTH'S stern battle ready.

A bit of tinsel on a rag,
With fringe around the border,
Round which to gather, shout and brag,
Is not the kind of order
For Agrarians to take, when they,
Like reasoning men, assemble
But at their calm, resolved array
Their direst foes must tremble

They come! They come! in phalanx deep,
Oppression's cohorts braving—
Unbought, unterrified, they keep
Their fsee bold banner waving:
They (as on Bunker's heights were stirred
The stern sires that begat them,)
Impatient wait the onset word
Agrarians! up, and at them!

FREEDOM'S LYRE.

Attune the chords of freedom's lyre,
To bounding notes of glee:
And swell upon each burning wire,
The anthems of the free!
Strike! strike again the notes of old,
That swept these hills along!
Where freedom's sons her flag unrolled
And shouted freedom's song!

Wake! wake the tones of victory now,
For freedom's hearts beat high!
And triumph sits on manhood's brow,
And speaks from woman's eye.
The sun that rose in cloud and gloom,
Now beams in radiance bright;
And in meridian splendor soon
Shall blaze with freedom's light.

When slavery's night shall pass away,
And wide o'er land and sea
Again on every breeze shall play
The banner of the free!
Then tune the lyre—let music sweep
Our hills and vales along!
While ocean's waves in gladness leap,
And dance to freedom's song!

THE CONSTITUTION.

Great were the hearts, and strong the minds.
Of those who framed, in high debate,
The immortal league of love that binds
Our fair broad Empire, State with State

And deep the gladness of the hour,
When, as the auspicious task was done.
In solemn trust, the sword of power
Was given to glory's unspoiled son.

That noble race is gone—the suns
Of fifty years have risen and set;
But the bright links, those chosen ones
So strongly forged, are brighter yet.

Wide—as our own free race increase—
Wide shall extend the elastic chain,
And bind in everlasting peace,
State after State, a mighty train.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

12Mar49HJ

16Jun'52WE

AUG 2 6 1952 LU

17Jan'58BP

REC'D LD
JAN 14 1958

11Jan'61RT

REC'D LD
JAN 2 8 361

31Mar'63PS

REC'D LD
MAR 31 1963

DAVIS
INTERLIBRARY LOAN

MAR 28 1972

NOV 27 1981

Dec 27 1981
Jan 27 1982

RET'D MAR 11 1982

MAY 3 1987

AUTO DISC MAY 22 1987

MAR 28 2005

LD 21-100m-9,'48(B399s16)476

YB 19129

M508373

HD8070
P5

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY

B000864034